00111047

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

HOW TO STUDY THE NEW TESTAMENT

ALEXANDER STRAHAN,

148, *Strand*, ... LONDON.
173, *Grand Street*, ... NEW YORK.

HOW TO STUDY THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE GOSPELS AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

111047

BY HENRY ALFORD, D.D. &c.

DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

ALEXANDER STRAHAN, PUBLISHER
LONDON AND NEW YORK
1869

00111047

PREFACE.

THE intention of this little volume is to put into the hands of the ordinary English reader, in a popular form, some of those results of thought and criticism which are commonly deposited out of his reach in bulky commentaries.

It may be thought that the lists of corrigenda which are appended to each chapter might better have been collected in one table at the end. But I have kept them in the place in which they originally appeared in the *Sunday Magazine*, having been informed by some of that class of readers for whom I especially intended the book, that they found it convenient for correcting the text of their Bibles, to have the mass thus broken up into portions.

I have added a short Appendix, containing a notice of the principal MSS. of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles.

DEANERY, CANTERBURY, *May* 1866.

CONTENTS.

THE GOSPELS.

I. INTRODUCTORY 1

II. THE THREE.—ST. MARK 28

III. THE THREE.—ST. MATTHEW 52

IV. THE THREE.—ST. LUKE 79

V. ST. JOHN 112

VI. THE FOUR NARRATIVES OF THE PASSION . 170

VII. THE FOUR NARRATIVES OF THE RESURRECTION 221

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

I. JERUSALEM 253

II. JERUSALEM TO ANTIOCH 285

III. ANTIOCH TO ROME 312

THE GOSPELS.

1.

INTRODUCTORY.

I HAVE in my mind a hill-side, from which is visible a long stretch of goodly prospect. Rich plains, with their masses of foliage varying their bright green meadows: towns, whose towers are reflected in rivers of ample breadth: hills, range after range, fading away into fainter blue, till the last promontory dips into the far-off sea, whose line stretches across the sky, keenly bright, flashing in the western sun.

Now of those who look on this prospect from the hill-side, there are several classes. The sheep and oxen around me are browsing on the grass, and heed it not. The labourer who holds the plough as he plods backward and forward across yon arable field, hardly heeds it more than they: not for want of faculty, but for want of use.

The ordinary passenger may turn his eye upon it and remark on some one circumstance—the shape of a cloud, the colour of the crops, the signs of fair weather or of rain : but little recks he of the exquisite scene before him. And of those who look upon it as being what it is, how various and how partial are the regards ! One has that general feeling of exhilaration which accompanies the recognition of beauty : that gladness which Homer puts into his shepherd's heart when the moon and stars are bright in the clear heaven. Another is straining his sight to find some well-known church-tower in the distance, or the roof of some beloved home among its sheltering trees. An artist is there, marking the various lines of colour which diversify the fair landscape, and how its lights and shades are distributed : a geologist, noting the signs given by the forms of hilly outline, and the nature of the local products of the soil. Or a student of history may have set himself down on a projecting knoll, and is even now mapping out in his mind the scene of some great conflict of the past ; where the invader landed, and how far his forces penetrated ; where the patriot bands met him ; with the advantages and disadvantages

of each army, as shown by the hill and dale spread beneath him. Or the engineer may be there with his theodolite, taking the levels for some great scheme of locomotion, or of sanitary improvement.

Now note, that each of these latter, in his examination of our landscape, sees things which others miss seeing. The colours of nature do not reveal themselves except to the eye practised in searching for and discriminating them: the contour of the hills has no meaning for him who knows not the phenomena of stratification; nor has the battle-field any interest for one who knows not the history of the battle; nor would an uninformed man care for the mysterious figures which are the engineer's working tools, or for their results, as shown on the landscape before him.

Note too another thing worth remarking. Of the spectators on that hill-side, one may know more, and one less, of the details of the wide-spread view. To one man's eye a certain corner may be most familiar. To every roof seen over the trees he can supply inmates: he knows where every field-path lies; where the gleaming river is lost among the thickets, he can tell you its exact course, and, if need be, every tree that rises from

its banks. This minute knowledge, however, cannot extend far. The *whole* prospect has, to every one looking on it, vast blanks which his foot never explored, mysteries which his penetration cannot fathom. Nay, in one sense, this is so over all its extent, and with all who see it. What is going on beneath those chimneys which symbolize human habitation, not one of the spectators can tell: what scenes of happiness or misery, of peace or strife: what souls are even now leaving those towns and villages for the final state, what souls are just waking in them to human consciousness.

All this, and the like of this, is absolutely hidden from all.

But there is one eye, now and ever looking on that fair scene, the eye of One to whom all these things are open: of One who Himself spread those hills and commanded those streams to flow, and said to that ancient sea, 'Hitherto shalt thou come.' No roof conceals aught from Him. The colours of the air and earth, in all their lovely combinations, were His arrangements; the stratified remnants of the ancient earth which lie hidden in the hills are all known to Him, for He made them all out of nothing, and His eye never slum-

bered while they were depositing: no event, past or present, which this tract of earth has witnessed or is witnessing, yea, no detail of its future destiny, is unknown to Him.

Now what reference has this long description to the subject at the head of my page? I answer, Much, and that obvious. It is a parable, not difficult to understand. That fair prospect sets forth to us the Gospels, rich in all fertility, beautiful in every detail, full of hidden interest, opening ever to those who seek it: concealing mysteries which no human eye can penetrate; but all known to Him from whom they came.

Let us stand for a moment, and contemplate the scene around us. The Church, our dwelling-place, is the city set on a hill, and the great landscape lies spread beneath, as we walk about in the streets and gardens of our home. There it is, with its pleasant places full of undying memories; with its grand rocky heights, and plains of green pasture, and glittering reaches of the river of the water of life; with His history running through it like a golden thread, who humbling Himself to be born in its lowliest valley, filling it with the battle-field of His conflict of love and self-sacrifice,

passed from His grave in the rock, up even to the right hand of God in heaven.

All this is open to the eyes of all in this our home. And yet there are many around us, who know no more of it all, and reck no more of it, than the kine which browse on the grass on the hill-side. They use it—not at all.

In other words,—for our parable has now done its work, and may be laid aside,—there are among us those who have no use of, no care for, the Holy Gospels of our Lord: of whose minds they form no part, into whose thoughts their glories never enter. And just as in order for a man to enjoy a prospect, even in the least and lowest degree, he must lift up his eyes and see it, so must these men have the Gospels brought within their view, and made parts of their thoughts, before they can profit by them at all.

And, even for this purpose, 'How to use the Gospels' is an important inquiry. For it is precisely those that know least of them, who know that little worst; know it carelessly, unintelligently, unprofitably. And as we advance upwards through the ranks of those who know more, how fragmentary, how insufficient, is commonly that

knowledge! How much do almost all persons whom we meet in ordinary society, want teaching how to use the Gospels, so as to make them serve the purposes for which they were intended!

For be it remembered, that God has not given us these inspired records of our Lord's life and teaching, in their present form, without a beneficent purpose. He might have given us *one* indubitable plain historic account. But He has given us *four*. These four might have been found in exact verbal accord as to every incident in our Lord's life, and every word spoken by Him: but they differ, and sometimes widely, in the expression, even where facts, and things said, are evidently the same. These Gospels, as they were written by the inspired authors, might have come down to us without any variety of reading in different authorities: they *have* come down to us with many thousand such varieties, of greater or less importance. They might have been by divine inspiration rendered into all the languages on earth; whereas they exist in verbal accuracy in one ancient language only, and the Churches of modern times have to accept and read them in fallible human versions.

It is with such points as these that the present chapters will mainly deal. The writer finds them in very great part set aside and ignored. Even in societies where information and intelligence on all ordinary matters are indispensable, any degree of ignorance on this matter passes muster without bringing reproach. The utmost that seems expected, even from the clergy themselves, is to be able to affirm, that the *Scripture* says so and so. But *what* Scripture says it,—with what intent,—how far, in the words quoted, the context is duly had in regard,—whether they do or do not rightly represent the sense of the original; these things not one *clergyman* in ten seems to take into account; still less those laymen, who would be ashamed to quote in the same slovenly manner any of the well-known classical authors. And as to ordinary English readers of the Gospels, it is not too much to say, that the way in which they use them seems to proceed on the assumption that there is but one Gospel, not four: that that one has been delivered down to us entire and indisputable in every point, and in one form, and that form, the English version, as published by King James's translators.

Now the present writer does not mean for a moment to say that the Holy Gospels may not be used for the confirmation of the faith, and the nourishment of the inner life, in the manner with which he is now finding fault. Blessed be God, they are so full of rich food for the soul, the seeds of divine truth lie so thickly scattered over them, and the affections are so powerfully drawn to Him who is their great subject, that even the most inadequate use of them in the most imperfect version may serve to bring souls to God; nay more,—that even a crumb of the blessed Bread of Life may sustain and re-create the man. Many a fainting spirit, in weakness and ignorance, has gathered strength from even one text of Holy Writ, treasured up and often thought on; and that too, when the one text itself has not, perhaps, been so apprehended as to carry its full or even its proper meaning.

But it is not of *bare sustenance* that we are now speaking; we are not inquiring *how little* use of the Gospels is compatible with life unto God; on the contrary, we would wish to be understood as endeavouring to set forth the provision here made for us in all its wonderful fulness and in its mani-

fold variety, and as inquiring how we may best avail ourselves of *every* means of profiting by God's revelation of His Blessed Son. Therefore let nothing here said be understood as casting doubt or depreciation upon the blessing which may accrue even from the most inadequate use of the Gospels. My anxiety is, if it may be, to point out how Scripture may be better used, and God more honoured, than is commonly the case; how we may not lose the things we have wrought, but receive our full reward: how Christ's Church, whose work for God, by the Spirit dwelling in her, these Scriptures are, may gain the utmost from them, and receive the divine treasure in full.

I would put in one more caution, and it is this: Let not anything here said be supposed in the least degree to impugn the truth of the special inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture by the Spirit of God. It seems to me, that it is assuming far too much respecting our knowledge of the mode and process of that inspiration, to tie it down to conditions such as we are compelled to lay down for human narration. How it wrought in the sacred writers we are unable to say, except that it was the especial influence of the Spirit of

Truth. We are certain that each of the Gospel narratives is, in the highest sense, true. But we are not certain that we can, by sight, assure ourselves, in each apparent case of discrepancy, that it is so. I have elsewhere maintained, and I maintain again here, that if we could know exactly how any given event related in the Gospels happened, we should at once be able to account for the variations in the narratives, and the separate truth of each would be shown. But, not knowing the exact details of any event thus narrated, nor the position of the narrator with respect to it, we often cannot undertake to reconcile apparent discrepancies between the Evangelists. Our plain duty, in making a right use of the Gospels, is, firmly and fearlessly to recognise these, and to leave them as fearlessly unsolved, if no honest solution can be found. A way may be opened by and by, in the process of human discovery, and the toil of human thought: or the time for a solution may not come, till the day when all things shall be known.

Let me then, in pursuance of these remarks, mention what I believe to be the requisites for the right use of the Gospels—indeed, of any portion of Holy Scripture.

And I will mention first, FAITH. These books of Holy Writ are totally unlike any other books in the world. Ever since they were first published, the best and purest and wisest of mankind have regarded them as inspired by God. The greatest change for good ever wrought among our species, has been the effect of these books. Wherever they are known, that change is still going on. It is no less than a change from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God. These books contain depths which the sublimest human intellect cannot fathom, beneath a tempting and beautiful surface which may attract the unlearned and the child. No imitations have ever come near them: never book spake like this Book. Well, then, in the name of all that is reasonable and consistent, trust this Book. Don't be ever trembling for it, still less ever cavilling at it. It can hold its own. The voice of God does not speak in it any the less, because to our dull ears it sometimes seems to send forth an uncertain sound. Let us take a manly line in this matter. This book is God's Book. It is the great light which He hath put in the firmament of the Church, to rule the day, rejoicing as a giant to run its course,

and to flood the earth with its blessed light. But the telescope shows me apparent spots in it. Does it therefore cease to be the sun? Shall I therefore refuse to walk and work by its light? Shall I not rather say, 'I know that those interruptions of light are themselves phenomena in the outpouring of the light? He who doeth all things well hath done this well also, though at this moment I may not know how.' Say not, unreasonably and untrustingly, 'I cannot believe this to be the sun, I cannot work by its light, unless it can be shown to me that there is not a spot on its bright surface.' He who does this throws an immense advantage into the hands of the unbeliever. He puts his faith at the mercy of every caviller. He throws his pearls before swine, who, having trampled them under their feet, will turn again and rend him.

Approach the holy Gospels from the side of trust and love, not from that of distrust and unchristian doubt. In them is found the blessed presence of Him whom, if you are a Christian, your soul loves above all things: of Him through whom you have your daily access to the Father of your spirit: of Him whose atoning blood, daily applied to your soul, is your only confidence

before God, in the midst of daily growing proofs of your own utter unworthiness: of Him whose victory over death is your only hope as years pass on, and the edges of the dark shadow begin to enfold you. You fear as you enter the cloud, but you are reassured, because in it He stands transfigured in light. These Gospels are the history of Him. How He from his awful Godhead was pleased to stoop to be born, as one of us, and yet not as one of us; how, in the emptying out of his glory as God, there grew up mysteriously around Him in his humiliation the elements of human knowledge; how, Himself without sin, He entered into conflict with sinners; how loving in the midst of severity, how gentle amidst sternness, how humble in the holding back of his power, was ever His bearing among those who hated Him: how holy and harmless was His going down into death, how glorious His victory over it.

Take these blessed facts as the life of your soul, and go to the Gospels to know more of them and of Him. When this is the main object, all else will easily fall into its place. He who is ever sitting at the feet of Jesus, and learning, will be listening more to His blessed words than to idle

voices which float in the air around. He who has his eyes fixed on the divine form of the Son of God in his glorified humanity will have small inclination to 'peep and botanize' with the poor paltry caviller. He whose daily sustenance is the bread of God which came down from heaven, and whose inner thirst is daily quenched by draughts of the water of life, will hardly be persuaded by those who tell him that there is no sustenance in the one, nor refreshment in the other. Depend upon it, FAITH is the great primary requisite for the right use of the Gospels.

And, next to faith, INTELLIGENCE. 'Be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is.' God has given us his Gospels, a revelation from heaven. HE, I say, has given them to us. They have not somehow escaped from His secret place like a document furtively abstracted by some officious angel, and found their way down into the world no one knows how; but every step of their compilation, promulgation, preservation, has been His especial care. Not only what they contain — their substance, — but the vehicle in which that substance is delivered, their language and outer phenomena; and not only that, again,

but the form in which, even to the minutest detail, their transmission to us has taken place; all these have not been as they are without His will; and those who ignore these, and determine to use the Gospels without taking them at all into account, will of necessity come short of the fulness of their use,—will of necessity lie open to the attacks of unbelief,—will of necessity be feeble and timorous, or, what is even worse, overbearing and rash, in their defence of the faith.

First, then, notice that this Holy Gospel which you are reading, and in which you trace the divine form of your Saviour and listen to His voice, is not written in words of light on the sky, one record, indivisible, indisputable. God made use of *four* instruments, *four* inspired men, to gather the facts and words into histories for you. He did not so inspire those Four, that they all wrote the same concerning the same thing, or that they all reported the same discourse in the same words. He was pleased that they should each look on the facts from a slightly different point of view, and each retain, or find retained, slightly differing groups of the sayings of the Lord. Now, as we have said, all this has not been accident,—is not

to be lamented,—is not to be passed over. It is so written for our learning. Various reasons, even in our incapacity to fathom the divine purposes, may be imagined why this should have been done. There might have been one supreme record, and one only; but this might have been perilous for a dispensation and a Church which was to regard not the letter, but the spirit, and to walk not by sight, but by faith.

And another matter is here to be noticed. We know these Gospels by the names of certain writers. But in the case of three of them, we have no authority whatever for such appropriation in the Gospels themselves, nor in any contemporary document. Trustworthy tradition alone is our warrant for believing St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke to have written the Gospels which bear their names. In the case of the fourth, it may be gathered almost with certainty from the contents of the Gospel itself, who it was that wrote it. But even here the writer's name is nowhere told us—nay, is purposely concealed. So little is there of documentary authentication, so little of the authority or dignity of mere names, about writings on which the faith of the Church is to rest all the ages

of the world. It is the character of the Gospels themselves, not the authority with which they come to us, on which it has pleased God to fix our attention. We are to value them for what they *are*, not for what they say they are. Let, then, *what they are* be our main study—the real character and contents of each, as discovered by intelligent search and discrimination.

But here another consideration meets us. These Gospels, so important to the Church, have not come to us in one undisputed form. We have no authorized copy of them in their original language, so that we may know in what precise words they were originally written. The authorities from which we derive their sacred text are various ancient copies, written by hand on parchment. Of the Gospels, there are more than *five hundred* of these manuscripts of various ages, from the fourth century after Christ to the fifteenth, when printing superseded manual writing for publication of books. Of these five hundred and more, no two are in all points alike: probably in no two of the more ancient can even a few consecutive verses be found in which all the words agree. Most of the differences are unimportant to the meaning;

but, on the other hand, some are very important, even to the omission in some copies, and insertion in others, of passages of considerable length. Obviously, of all these manuscripts, those which are the most ancient are the most valuable. And we can tell which are the most ancient, by knowing what *manner of writing* prevailed at different times. We have of the Gospels two manuscripts, containing them nearly entire, which belong to the *fourth* century: one, besides many fragments of others, written in the *fifth* century: another, and that a very remarkable one, which apparently dates from the *sixth*.[1] In these very ancient documents, the forms of the sacred text are sometimes widely divergent. Nay, a remarkable phenomenon is forcing itself on the minds of those who have been widely conversant with these oldest authorities, viz., that the further back we go, the more divergent in mere outward form become the wordings of the same passages which are narrated by the Gospels in common, and also the more divergent in the different primitive manuscripts become the mere words of the sacred text throughout. The truth appears to have been, that in those early days, as is also clearly shown by the quota-

[1] For details concerning these, see the Appendix.

tions of Scripture in the works of the Fathers, men cared little for the precise words, provided the sense were correctly given. 'What matters it,' says St. Augustine, in commenting on the cry, 'Save, Lord: we perish,'—the words and time of utterance of which are variously reported by the Evangelists,—'What matters it, whether the disciples, in calling on the Lord, really used one or another of these expressions, or some other, differing from them all, but still giving the sense that they were perishing, and called on Him to save them?' Here is a noble example of one who made right use of, and could trust, the Gospels. Strive to imitate this. Be intelligent enough to recognise, and believing enough not to be afraid of, these differences of Gospel from Gospel, and of various forms of the same passage in the same Gospel. Not the form, but the substance, is to save thy soul: for the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.

Another point of importance, which in a proper use of the Gospels an ordinary Christian reader must not fail to discern, is, that he possesses them, not in their original tongue, but in a translation made from that tongue into his own. This like-

wise is, God's will respecting him, and it is not for him to ignore it by acting as if it were otherwise. It is no accident, that the English reader is compelled to use the Scriptures in a form in which man, and not God, has written them. He who has made of one blood all nations on the earth, and has fixed their times and the bounds of their habitation, so arranged the issues of things, that the revelation of Himself by Christ should be originally written in the most wonderful and powerful of human tongues. The Greek language possesses capacities for expressing minute differences, and for fathoming profound depths, of thought, of which our own tongue is destitute. In rendering from one into the other, very much must be sacrificed: very much of fulness of meaning, of variety of possible senses, of power to attract and to convince. This would be the case, even were the translation faultlessly accurate, and made by infallible authority. But I need not say, that no translation has ever possessed these qualities. The English version, for faithfulness, for simplicity, for majesty, will bear comparison with any that ever has been made: yet it is not a word more than the truth to say, that

it abounds with errors and inadequate renderings.

In this matter let me speak plainly, and say that the Church of Christ in this land has not acted faithfully by her members. A formidable list of passages might be given, in which our version either has confessedly misrendered the original, or has followed a form of the text now well known not to have been the original form. These might be corrected at any time: and it is a grievous thing that this has not been done, or is not now in doing. For, as matters now stand, we are printing for reading in our churches, we are sending forth into the cottage and the mansion, books containing passages and phrases which pretend to be the Word of God, and are not: and that, when the remedy is most easy, and lies at any time in our power. Let a commission of men learned in the Scriptures be appointed, chosen from among our different Christian denominations, with definite powers as to this weighty matter, to be exercised under proper safeguards; and in a few years at most this stumbling-block will have been removed. The time may not have been ripe for it a short while ago, but I believe it is ripe for it

now, at least as far as regards the New Testament. And mind, I speak not as a youthful enthusiast, but as one whose life, now not a short one, has been mainly spent in the study of the Sacred Word; not as a lover of change in this matter, but as an ardent admirer and lover of the dear old English words of our national Bible. Let us not lose one well-known text in that our precious inheritance, unless it be, in the estimation of all who are capable of judging, a right hand which ought to be cut off, an eye which must be plucked out. But the state of things at present is most unsatisfactory. As a nation, and as Churches, are we making a right use of the holy Gospels, or of the rest of God's revealed Word, till these blemishes are removed?

What then ought to be, on the mind of the English reader, the effect of this last treated fact —the necessary imperfection of the particular vehicle in which God's providence has transmitted the Gospels to him? Not distrust: not unbelief. Were this version tenfold more imperfect than it is, there would be no excuse for either of these. The glories of the everlasting Gospel, as seen in Him who is its subject, are not

blotted out for him. The treasure within is not less precious, for a few comparatively insignificant flaws in the earthen vessel containing it. Dig thou ever in this thy field for the treasure passing all price, even Christ the hope of glory. The soil may yet be rough; some stones remaining to turn the edge of thy tool, some clods unbroken which pass thy strength to cleave asunder: but for all these, thou shalt find, if thou seekest aright. Only go not about boasting vainly of thy possession of this holy Book, without in fact really possessing it at all. For only he can be said in any worthy sense to *possess* it, who knows what the will of God has been towards him in it and by it, both as to its inner contents, and as to its outward form and transmission to himself.

In concluding these general preliminary observations, I would yet mention *two* requisites for the right use of the Gospels. The former of these is, HONESTY; a straightforward manly spirit, afraid of no truth, disclaiming all compromise with falsehood. Whatever certain apologists for their defection from the truth may say, there is, depend upon it, *no just cause* which can excuse a lie. Nay, the better the cause, the worse the falsehood;

because it betrays the more distrust of Him who will suffer no good thing to fail. And some, shame to say, have endeavoured to save the credit of the Holy Gospels by concealing, by palliating, by solving inadequately and unfaithfully, these difficulties and these drawbacks of which we have been treating. Do thou, my reader, who wishest to live in the light of God and by the example of Christ, not consent unto these persons. Handle not the Word of God deceitfully. Every fact respecting it is God's fact, sent by God to thee for thy good. Fear it not; face it, and give it its due influence. It may seem unwelcome at first—a visitor whose aspect and speech jar on thy snug system of cherished home-thoughts; but depend upon it, thou wilt have entertained an angel unawares. Only be sure that it is genuine, and not an idle fiction of the enemy. For in our days the enemy is very busy. Men who ought to know better, are striving to overthrow the faith of the Church by approaching the Scriptures from a hostile point of view, and cavilling at statements in them which the most ordinary common sense seems to explain satisfactorily. Be not, on the other hand, deceived

by these fair-seeming writers. Do not let them quietly assume, as they do, all the credit for honesty, and brand us believers with disingenuousness. Show them that we are as truthful as they are; show them that there is at least as much honesty and manliness in a hearty defence of the faith, as in their boastful abandonment of it. Give not the unbeliever a monopoly of fair dealing. Be true, while you believe; and pray that he too may be some day convinced, that the only way to be true, is to believe.

And the other requisite is CHARITY. In fact, the one requisite above all others. Oh, my brothers, we all speak and write too many hard, bitter words; we all indulge in too many cruel sentences; we are all trying to break, not to mend, the bruised reed. In this matter of the Holy Gospels, especially, do we need the blessed gift of charity. *They* are not Christ, but were given to lead to Christ. And if any seem to have laid hold on Christ by their means, blessed is that man—whether he know little or much, whether he be aware of anything else respecting them or not. Let this ever be borne in mind by us. While we are striving to be strong in the

faith, let us not despise the faith of the weakest. For there will come a day to us all when, in the giving way of the powers of nature, and the pouring in of the great waterfloods, we shall grasp at something which may hold us up and carry us over. And then, not how much we have searched out and known, not how much we have disputed and prevailed, will help us; but how much we have lived on Christ, and heard in our souls of His own life-giving voice, and how much we have shown in the world of His meek and lowly example.

For this, use the Gospels; for this, search into them and appreciate them:—not to argue and dispute out of, not to become vain and puffed up by, but to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

II.

THE THREE.—ST. MARK.

WE will suppose ourselves taking a survey of the world, with reference to the spread of Christianity, at some considerable distance of time, say thirty or forty years, after our Lord's ascension into heaven.

We see the faith planted in a multitude of places. In various large cities churches have grown up, round which, as so many great centres, the work, as to its organization and vital energy, seems grouped. If Jerusalem has not yet passed into the shade of her great final trouble, she is of these centres the chief. Antioch is certainly another of hardly inferior importance; Ephesus is another, and Alexandria; and last, but certainly not least, imperial Rome. In all these, and in hundreds of smaller cities, 'the Gospel' of Christ is actively

and constantly preached. But let us choose simpler terms, more in accordance with the original meaning of these very familiar words, and with the real work of those times. Let us not say 'the Gospel was preached,' but 'the good news was proclaimed.'

What good news? The tidings of that which God had done by His Son Jesus. And to whom did the Church look for these good tidings? Mainly, and in the first place, of course, to those who had been eye-witnesses of the facts themselves. Of these a set number had been especially constituted authoritative witnesses of these facts. To them had been committed the remembrance of the sayings of Him whose words were spirit and life. Their oral narratives had been for the most part nearly in the same strain, especially as regarded those sacred words of the Lord. But in different parts of the Christian world, according as the living voice of this or that Apostle was present, the great main narrative took different shapes and arrangements. Truth they all told—truth of a more precise and higher order than narrative founded on human accuracy can usually attain; but each, from the very circumstance of his having

been himself present at the occurrence of the facts, gave them as they impressed his own character, and were reproduced by his own individual feelings. One loved to describe to his hearers the very look and gesture of the Lord as He spoke comfort or warning; another seems ever given to contemplate Him as the King and Lord of Israel announced in Old Testament prophecy, to retain in faithful memory the long connexion of His wonderful discourses, and to enounce with reverent recollection their stately periods; while another, or more than one, in different fields of Gentile labour, might love to dwell on those of His sayings and acted parables which had world-wide reference—might love to look on Him as the light of the Gentiles, as well as the glory of His people Israel. And so various narratives grew up here and there, all showing in the main form the common testimony which all the Apostles bore before they parted from Jerusalem, but differently deflected from that common narrative in things indifferent. St. Peter might give, in his missionary journeys, one of these accounts, St. Matthew another, St. Philip and St. Andrew another, and so of the rest. But at or before the time when

our survey is taken, these venerable men were drawing near to the end of their course; peril and persecution were gathering round them, and it was evident that the living voice of inspired eye-witnesses would very soon be lost to the Church.

Then it was that the Divine Spirit, ever watchful and working among those that are Ghrist's, put it into the heart of one here and another there to commit these apostles' testimonies to writing, that they might remain with the Church for ever. We will suppose, as seems most probable, that the idea was first suggested to Marcus, sister's son to St. Barnabas, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles. He at that time was working with and under St. Peter, and he took to writing down the good tidings, in all its blessed vividness and power, as it was usually delivered by the Apostle. We are told that he was 'Peter's interpreter,' in what exact sense we cannot say; but, his name bearing a Roman form, we may well suppose that he was more conversant with the current Greek and Latin than the fisherman of Bethsaida, and that he thus was enabled to set down for common use that which the Apostle spoke to the Churches. One account tells us that St. Peter, on becoming aware

of his employment, neither encouraged nor discouraged him; another, that the Apostle carefully supervised that which had been written. It is remarkable that the Gospel of St. Mark is exactly contained within the limits which St. Peter himself prescribes for the necessary experience of a candidate for the Apostleship:[1] 'beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day when He was taken up from us.' Ancient tradition also reports that this Gospel was drawn up at Rome; but this appears somewhat uncertain, because we do not know, and the ancients did not know, whether St. Peter, when he mentions 'Babylon' as the place of writing his first epistle, meant Babylon in the East, or the mystical Babylon, viz., Rome.

At the same time, or somewhat later, 'while St. Peter and St. Paul were founding the Church at Rome,' the apostle Matthew himself undertook the writing of his own most grave and precious testimony to the words and deeds of Jesus. The ancients say that he originally drew it up in the Hebrew language. But there is some question whether those who repeat this may not have been deceived by the existence at that time of a 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' which certainly in

[1] Acts i. 22.

many essential points coincided with that of St. Matthew. In Palestine, where this Gospel was probably written, Greek was the language commonly spoken by the people. It seems probable that our Lord Himself ordinarily spoke that language. When St. Paul made to the Jews the speech of Acts xxii. in the Hebrew tongue, it was an unusual thing, and caused them to pay deeper attention. And all over the East the conquests of the great Alexander, three hundred years before, had spread the Greek language. If we desire to reconcile probability, and the internal evidence of the Gospel itself, there need be no difficulty in supposing that St. Matthew may have himself published it in both languages—the one edition specially for Jews, the other for general use. If this were so, the Hebrew Gospel was rejected by the Jews, and the Christian Jews themselves having soon lost their distinctive position in the Church, this form of the original writing has perished.

I shall return presently to the consideration of the character and use to be made of each of the three Gospels: let me now complete my sketch of their origin by saying something of the third.

Here the case is somewhat altered. The writer

himself, in a preface, informs us of the circumstances under which, and the view with which, his work was composed. We have now arrived at a time when many persons had taken in hand to draw up narratives containing the testimony of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word. It seems good to this person also, to set down in order the details of the things unanimously received among Christians. He has accurately traced them down from the first. He composes his work primarily and ostensibly for the benefit of a convert in high station called Theophilus, but also evidently with a view, under this dedication, to the use and benefit of the Church in general. Where this Gospel was written, and when and where the materials were gathered, is uncertain. The universal tradition of the Church reports Lucas or Luke as the name of the author, and identifies him with the 'beloved physician,' who appears in two of St. Paul's epistles to have been his constant companion. And, seeing that we have positive evidence, in the preface to the Acts of the Apostles, that the same person wrote that book who was the author of the Gospel, and in the course of that book, that its writer was the constant com-

panion of St. Paul, we arrive at a tolerably complete idea of the personality and position of the writer of the third Gospel. And having done this, if we now look down the course of St. Paul's missionary journeys, we find times when Luke might well have been employed in gathering materials for his Gospel. There is a long interval after the imprisonment at Philippi, during which the Evangelist does not appear—there is a long suspension of St. Paul's active missionary work, owing to his imprisonment at Cæsarea, during which time Luke may have been employed, in Jerusalem or elsewhere, in taking down the apostolic testimony.

If the materials were gathered during either or both of these intervals, it is hardly probable that the Gospel itself was published until some time considerably later than both of them. The very words of its preface, stating, as they do, that *many* had undertaken to draw up narratives embodying the apostolic testimony, would place the third Gospel far on in the period which closed the apostolic age; not to mention that the work of careful and laborious compilation bears of itself a later character than that of single independent testi-

mony, whether this latter be set down by the witness himself, or by another for him.

There is one interesting question concerning these three Gospels, the treatment of which will lead us into that also of their mutual relations one to another. Is it likely that either of the three Evangelists had seen and worked upon the previous work of another? The theory commonly received by persons who have not examined into the matter, and even still upheld by some who have examined, is, that one of the Evangelists having written first, the second, having this finished work before him, composed his own Gospel with a definite purpose in view, working in or omitting what he found in that first; then that the third acted in like manner with the two others already finished and lying before him. I purposely, in giving an account of this theory, suppress names of the Evangelists, because among those who hold it the order is very variously given, so variously, indeed, as to comprise every one of the six permutations which can be made of the three.

Now I will only say of this theory, that it does not correspond to what we find in the Gospels themselves; and that any one need but compare

together any three or any two portions of different Gospels, containing the same subject-matter, to be convinced of its entire untenableness.

According to this theory, to take an example, St. Luke, with the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark before him, sat down to write the account of an incident which they had previously narrated. He knew both their accounts to be true, and had no fault to find with either. Under such circumstances we may well conceive him incorporating the two together, in order to form a more complete account, adding such new particulars as he himself in the course of investigation had discovered.

But examine his narrative, and you will find that nothing can be further from a description of it. On this theory, it is the most strange and capricious composition that has ever been seen. For, in writing it, he arbitrarily sometimes writes in the same words as one, sometimes as another; sometimes expresses a detail related by both, but in words which neither of them has used; sometimes omits important details related by one or both, and writes as if he were not aware of their existence. I have said elsewhere, and say again, that

if this, or any form of this theory, is to be adopted, then two at least of our three Evangelists can hardly have been men in their sober senses, so strangely and capriciously must they have written.

But adopt the other view, and all falls readily into its place. The oral narrative was common in its main points to all the Apostles, but modified as to detail and verbal expression. While it rendered for the most part in the same words the leading sayings of our Lord, it varied very much the language in which the connecting links of mere narrative were given. As the disposition of each was inclined to graphic narration, or mere matter-of-fact expression,—to giving the precise words used, or merely their general sense,—so these portions would be variously expressed. One might report simply that *Jesus answered and said;* another, that *looking round on his disciples, He answered,* and so on. Each would have been especially impressed by that aspect of an incident which laid hold of his own feelings and sympathies. According as minor details served to illustrate this, they would be dwelt on and brought out into notice. Any unusual word used by our Lord, any fact which

admitted of but one way of description, would be reproduced exactly in all the narratives; while other sayings and details would be very variously expressed.

Now this is exactly what we do find in our three Gospels, as any one will see who will take the trouble to compare those sections, which they contain in common. And I conclude therefore, —and I may state that this is now becoming the general conclusion among those who examine into the matter,— that our Gospels represent three forms of the oral apostolic testimony, committed to writing, under the direction and inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, independently of one another.

Having endeavoured to make this plain, I will now go on to consider each of the three Gospels by itself: setting down, in accordance with what was proposed in my first paper, such particulars regarding its use as may seem to be most desirable for the English reader to know, and least likely to have been brought under his notice in his ordinary course of Scripture reading.

First, we will treat of the Gospel of St. Mark. It is the shortest, and certainly in its form the earliest of the three—not enriched with those addi-

tions which arose from documents preserved in the Holy Family and among the primitive disciples, but, as has been already remarked, confined within the limits of the public career of our Lord.

I have before hinted that this Gospel is, in its style of description, the most minute and graphic of the three. It has been well observed by Mr. Westcott, in his most valuable little work *On the Study of the Gospels*, that 'there is not perhaps one narrative which St. Mark gives in common with St. Matthew and St. Luke, to which he does not contribute some special feature.'

I will indicate a few of the more remarkable of these, leaving my readers to follow out the interesting study for themselves by comparing, with the aid of the references in their Bibles, the common portions in the three Gospels. I will first notice some places where minute particulars are given which give life and reality, and seem to put us in the very presence of the thing related.

In ch. ii. 2, we learn 'that there was no more room, *no, not so much as about the door:*' in ch. iv. 37, 38, we have in the description of the storm, this additional particular, that[1] the

[1] I quote always from the revised text in my *New Testament for English Readers.*

'*waves beat or were beating into the ship*, so that it was now filling: and He was *in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on the pillow:*' ch. vi. 48, 'He was *minded to pass by them*,' giving us the very look of disregard and fixed purpose which they saw: ch. ix. 16, where the very impression of one who came down with Jesus from the mount is given in the words, 'He saw *a great multitude about them* (the disciples), *and the scribes questioning them:*' in ch. x. 50, we read of the blind man on the way out of Jericho, that 'he *cast away his garment, and leaped up*, and came to Jesus.' Sometimes we have, in precious and exquisite touches, the mental impressions of hearers or eye-witnesses imparted to us; as for instance in that great description of our Lord's journeying up to Jerusalem, ch. x. 32, 'And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem: and *Jesus went before them: and they were amazed:* and *as they followed they were afraid.*' See also verses 24, 26, of the same chapter, where, after the first declaration of the difficulty of a rich man entering the kingdom of God, we read that '*the disciples were astonished* at his words;' and after the second and

more severe, saying that '*they were astonished out of measure.*' In two places, ch. vi. 31, and viii. 3, we have touching revelations given us of minute details of the feeling of our Lord himself. In the former place, when the Apostles had related to Him the particulars of their own mission, and (as we learn from St. Matthew xiv. 12) the intelligence of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, we read, 'He said unto them, *Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while;* for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.' In the latter, when (as in Matt. xv. 32) the sympathy of Jesus with the multitudes has been related, 'If I send them away fasting to their own houses, they will faint by the way,' St. Mark gives the additional reason, '*for divers of them came from far.*' From this Evangelist we have nearly all the accounts of the very look and feeling of Jesus: see ch. iii. 5, 'When He had *looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts:*' iii. 34, 'He *looked round about on them that sat about Him*, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren.' Compare also ch. v. 32, 'He *was looking round* (so literally) to see her that had done

this thing :' vi. 6, 'He *marvelled at their unbelief :*' x. 21, 'Jesus *looking on him loved him :*' also ch. x. 23, xi. 11. In five places this Evangelist preserves our Lord's words, which had so struck on the ear of the hearer as that their sound never was forgotten, in the very language in which they were spoken : ch. iii. 17 ; v. 41 ; vii. 11 ; vii. 34 ; xiv. 36. In the sublime ending of ch. ix., St. Mark gives the solemn repetition, or burden, of our Lord's discourse, verses 44, 46, 48, in a way which shows the same, viz., that the sensitive ear had caught the very words as uttered, and the faithful memory refused to part with one of them.

The additional details of circumstances given by our Evangelist are most numerous. I set down a very few. If the reader will consult Mr. Westcott's volume above quoted, he will find (note at p. 345) a far more copious list. Ch. i. 36, '*Simon and they that were with him* followed after Him :' ch. iii. 22, 'The *scribes which came down from Jerusalem* said :' ch. xiii. 3, '*Peter and James and John and Andrew* asked him privately :' ch. v. 13, '*they were about two thousand :*' ch. vi. 40, 'They all sat down *in ranks, by hundreds and by fifties :*' ch. xiv. 30, 'Before the cock crow

twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.' Again, notice the minute details of time and place given, ch. i. 35, 'in the morning, *rising up a great while before day:*' ch. iv. 35 (a very important notice, bearing, as we shall see in our next paper, on the arrangement of the earlier chapters of St. Matthew), '*the same day when the even was come:*' ch. xv. 25, 'it was the *third hour:*' ch. ii. 13, '*by the seaside:*' iii. 7, iv. 1, 'there was gathered to Him a great multitude, so that He *entered into the ship and sat in the sea:*' xii. 41, 'Jesus sat *over against the treasury.*'

It will be seen, by this very imperfect selection, how much of vivid reality and exact detail, in our idea of the Lord's life and ministry, we owe to this shorter Gospel. We may also see how entirely beside the point any account of it is, which makes it to have been merely an abridgment of St. Matthew or of St. Luke.

It remains that I should endeavour to furnish my readers with two statements which may be useful to them. The first, of the more remarkable places where our present text in this Gospel is not that of the most eminent authorities; the second, of the more remarkable instances where

our translators have not given us the force of the original.

In ch. i. 2, for '*the prophets*,' ought to be read 'Esaias the prophet:' and the words '*before thee*,' which end the verse, should be omitted. In ver. 4, for '*John did baptize in the wilderness*,' should be read, 'John the Baptist was in the wilderness preaching.' In ch. iii. 29, for '*in danger of eternal damnation*,' should be read 'guilty of eternal sin.' In ch. ii. 17, the words '*to repentance*' should be omitted; and in ch. iii. 5, the words '*as the other*.' In ch. iv. 24, '*unto you that hear shall more be given*,' ought to be 'more shall be given unto you.' In ch. vi. 11, the words 'Verily I say unto you,' etc., to the end, should most probably be omitted; and in ver. 44 the word '*about*' is in none of the ancient authorities. In ch. ix. 31, x. 34, '*the third day*' should be 'after three days.' In ch. xi. 8, '*off the trees*' should be 'out of the fields.' In xii. 32, for '*thou hast said the truth: for there is one God*,' read, 'thou hast truly said that He is one.' In xiii. 4, '*when all these things shall be fulfilled*,' should be 'when these things are about to be all fulfilled.' In ver. 14, the words '*spoken of by Daniel the prophet*,' should be omitted. In

ch. xiv. 22, the word '*eat*' should be omitted, and in consequence we must read it, 'Take this: this is,' etc.: in ver. 24, '*new*' should be omitted, and in consequence we had better say, 'the blood of the covenant:' in ver. 27, '*because of me this night*,' and in ver. 70, the clause, '*and thy speech agreeth thereto*,' should be omitted. Ver. 28 of ch. xv. should be omitted altogether. At the end of the Gospel a very remarkable variation in reading is found. The whole passage, from ch. xvi. ver. 9 to the end, is wanting in some of our oldest manuscript copies. The opinion of those who have examined and are best able to weigh the evidence concerning it is, that, for some unexplained reason, the original Gospel of St. Mark, as possessed by the primitive Church, ended abruptly with the words 'for they were afraid,' ver. 8: that, during apostolic times, and by apostolic and inspired men, the general compendium of the events of the Resurrection, with which the present Gospel concludes, was added. It is, as the reader of the Greek may observe, not in the style of St. Mark, containing many words and expressions which that Evangelist never elsewhere uses. But it has all the marks and the authority

of a contemporary record; and it contains several particulars not otherwise told us. It is remarkable that in our oldest manuscript, now in the Vatican Library at Rome, the writer left a space for the passage at the end of this Gospel: an occurrence not found in that manuscript at the end of any other Gospel; but, having left the space, he determined not to fill it up.

I now pass to those places where our English rendering of the original requires correction.

In ch. i. 10, '*opened*' should be 'cleft asunder.' In ver. 14, '*put in prison*' should be 'delivered up.' In ch. ii. 18, '*used to fast*' ought to be 'were fasting;' namely, at the particular time when the incident happened. In ver. 27, it should be, 'The Sabbath was made on account of man, and not man on account of the Sabbath.' In ch. iii. 14, '*ordained*' conveys to the English reader a wrong idea: it should be 'appointed.' In ch. iv. 11, instead of '*Unto you it is given to know the mystery*,' it should be, 'Unto you is given the mystery.' In ver. 22, '*abroad*' should be 'to light.' In ver. 37, '*it was now full*' ought to be, 'it was now filling:' and in the next verse, '*a pillow*' should be 'the pillow:' and in

ver. 41, '*What manner of man is this?*' should be, 'Who then is this?' In ch. v. 30, for '*virtue*' should stand 'power.' In ver. 36, for '*heard the word that was spoken*,' substitute 'overheard the word being spoken.' In ch. vi. 20, '*observed him*,' ought to be 'kept him safe,' *i.e.*, in custody. In ver. 21, for '*chief estates*,' substitute 'chief men.' In ver. 49, '*a spirit*' ought to be 'an apparition:' it is not the same word in the original as in Luke xxiv. 37. In ver. 56, '*streets*' should be 'market-places.' In ch. vii. 11, the words after 'mother' ought to stand thus: 'That wherein thou mightest have been benefited by me is Corban; that is to say, a gift.' In ver. 28, '*yet*' should be 'for even,' making the woman's argument clear. In ver. 31, '*coasts*,' a word now understood to mean 'parts by the sea,' should be 'borders;' so also in ch. x. 1. In ch. viii. 36, 37, '*soul*' ought to be 'life,' as in ver. 35: it is the same word in the original. The latter part of ch. ix. ver. 12, is a question, not an affirmation and ought to stand, 'and how is it written of the Son of Man,' etc.? In ch. x. 52, it ought to be 'thy faith hath saved thee.' In ch. xi. 17, 'an house of prayer for all the nations.' In ch. xii

26, 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the history concerning the bush, how God spake unto him:' and in the next verse, 'God is not the God of dead men, but of living.' In ver. 39, for '*uppermost rooms*,' substitute 'chief places.' In ch. xiii. 12, '*shall cause them to be put to death*' should have been, 'shall put them to death.' Verse 28 should begin, 'Now learn the parable from the fig-tree: when now her branch becometh tender.' In ver. 32, '*no man*' ought to be 'none:' and '*neither*,' 'nor even.' In ch. xiv. 2, '*on the feast day*' should be 'during the feast.' In ver. 18, our Lord's words should stand, 'One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me:' and Peter's words in ver. 31, 'If I must die with thee.' In ver. 38, it should be, 'The spirit truly is willing:' the word is the same as in Matt. xxvi. 41, and ought not to have been varied. In ver. 68, 'I neither know him, nor:' and in ver. 69, 'the maid,' omitting '*again*.' In ch. xv. 5, '*yet answered nothing*,' ought to be 'made him no further answer.' In verses 31, 32, it ought to stand, 'himself he cannot save, the Christ, the King of Israel. Let him descend now,' etc. In verses 37, 39, '*gave up the ghost*' should

be 'breathed his last,' the word being different from that in St. Matthew, which is properly 'rendered up his spirit.' In ch. xvi. 2, '*at the rising of the sun*,' should be 'when the sun was risen.' In ver. 8, it should have been, according to the striking expression of the original, 'for trembling and amazement had possession of them.' In ver. 12, '*appeared*' should be 'was manifested:' and in ver. 14, '*the eleven*' should be 'the eleven themselves.' In ver. 15 (as in Rom. viii. 22, where the words are the same), it should be, not '*every creature*,' but 'the whole creation.' And lastly, in ver. 20, '*signs following*' should be 'the signs that followed.'

The reader will understand that the foregoing list comprehends only a selection from the principal places where corrections are needed: that there are very many more, where the sense might be made clearer, and the expression more accurate, by a closer rendering of the original. Those which I have given must merely be looked on as an humble contribution to the better use of the Gospel by those who cannot have recourse to large books, but possess only their English Bibles. It is hoped that the little which has been here

said of the shortest and perhaps least studied of the three Gospels, may serve in some measure to illustrate the parable with which these papers began, and to show what riches the prospect contains for those who will look on it aright.

III.

THE THREE.—ST. MATTHEW.

PERHAPS it is hardly possible for us at this distance of time, and under circumstances so widely different, to form an idea of the views and feelings of a pious Jew who viewed Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ. If we could do so, doubtless many difficult portions of the Gospels would be placed in a clear light. And the nearer we endeavour to approach the idea, the more I am persuaded we shall be enabled to discern of their design and meaning.

Matthew the publican,—Levi the son of Alphæus,—one and the same person,—was evidently, even before the apostolic power came upon him, no common man. Himself a pious Jew, brought up to read and to love the prophets, and to anticipate the future glories of Israel,

he followed an occupation which severed him from his countrymen. The teachers, and the punctilious observers, of the law which he obeyed, would have deemed themselves polluted by contact with the publican of Capernaum. Yet, as was said afterwards by our Lord of another publican, Zacchæus, 'he himself also was a son of Abraham.' And this peculiarity of his situation must be taken into account, if we would understand the character of his Gospel. It may be noticed, that we have in the evangelic history several instances of pious God-fearing men, who were for some reason or other cut off from the common life of the Jews; and, corrupted and spiritless as that ordinary life was, it may not unreasonably be supposed that among the outcasts from it were frequently found men in closer walk with the God of Israel Himself. It was not from the Rabbis of the synagogue, but from the constant communings of his own heart with the word, that Matthew learned to look at all things in the light of the coming Kingdom. Little as he then knew of its real character, or of Him who was its King, this was manifestly the bent of his mind. His thoughts had long dwelt on the glories and

the trials of God's people, and had been wavering, with ever-increasing light and approximation to truth, till those blessed forty days of resurrection joy, when his eyes saw the King in his beauty, and his ears heard Him speaking of 'the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.'

Thenceforward the teaching of St. Matthew was such as we now see it in his wonderful Gospel—THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. This was the great comprehensive theme which took up and included in itself the details of the common apostolic narrative; and it was this Kingdom, not in the vague aspirations of an enthusiastic Jew—not as painted by the carnal imagination of man—but in all its spiritual depth and height, as revealed by that Holy One who knoweth the deep things of God. Its poverty and its wealth, its meekness and its majesty, its shame and its glory, its persecution and its recompense, all are laid forth in that Gospel which may well be called the Charter of the Constitution of the Church of Christ. And through all its onward narrative moves His form, of whom Moses in the law and the Prophets did write, in all His majesty, and all His gentleness. HIS very breath breathes from the sentences.

Never can the Evangelist dwell too long on His great and glorious discourses. Wide as the world of men and angels, deep as the heart of God, woven together as to their separate parts by links of inseparable power, it is from this one alone of the Three Evangelists that we have the great sermons of the Prophet of Galilee in all their completeness. The Sermon on the Mount, in chapters v., vi., vii.; the commission given to the Apostles in chapter x.; the discourse respecting John in chapter xi.; the great series of parables in chapter xiii.; that other, spoken during the last week of the ministry, in chapters xxi. and xxii.; the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, in chapter xxiii.; the great prophecy in chapter xxiv.; completed by the final parables, and description of the judgment of the nations, in chapter xxv.; all these, in their completeness and their arrangement, we owe to St. Matthew; besides many other important parables and portions of our Lord's divine teaching. The Holy Spirit seems to have wrought in this Evangelist to the largest reproduction of the *popular* teaching of Christ, as He did in the beloved disciple, St. John, to the reproduction of those words uttered in conflict

with the Jews, and in holy confidence to His own disciples. If we would have a living idea of those events in Galilee, in holy deed and in word, we need but combine the graphic description of St. Mark's narrative with the majesty of the Lord's discourses as given by St. Matthew, filling in the details, and here and there winning some precious additional story, from the third Evangelist, the careful investigator and summer-up of the whole.

But as we have before said that TO FIND OUT CHRIST is the great aim of the use of the Gospels, let us hasten to inquire into the exact portraiture of our Blessed Lord, as it is set before us by this Evangelist. Does any wish to see Him as the Messiah foretold in prophecy,—the long expected King and Prophet, who was to spring of Abraham and David—who was the bright point to which all lines of light converged under the old dispensation? Let him take up this Gospel, which, beginning with words of themselves recalling the Old Testament, shews, by the official genealogy of the Lord, how He was 'the son of David, the son of Abraham;' how He was foretold in the sign promised to assure Ahaz of his deliverance; how His Name, that of an ancient leader and champion

of Israel, was prescribed by an angel as significant of his work of salvation for his people. Then let him mark, how to the cradle of the new-born King Arabia and Saba bring their gifts—and see, amidst the splendour, the first little cloud of persecution arise, and the first blood shed for the King and the Kingdom's sake. And through all he shall hear, if he listen, the echo of the old prophets; 'All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophets.' The flight into Egypt, and the return from thence, happen, that Israel's King may share Israel's destiny. The turning back to Nazareth,—here we know the earthly reason of it, because the son of the persecutor ruled in Judea: and here we know the heavenly reason of it also; because the prophets had said, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'

And now years have passed away, and the Kingdom is ready to be ushered in: and in the wilderness of Judea appears one to prepare the way before the King, crying, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,' and proclaiming the spiritual conditions of the Kingdom, repentance and purity of life. By this Forerunner, the Elias of the new dispensation, it is necessary that the Messiah be

anointed; and to him Jesus coming is baptized, and on his baptism is solemnly recognised of God by the bodily descending upon him of the Holy Ghost, and the voice of the Father from heaven.

Then goes forth the King to His work of saving His people from their sins. First, over the tempter and accuser of men, He gains, in the fight of temptation, a glorious triple victory, in the matters of fleshly appetite—of carnal self-confidence—of worldly ambition. In His victory, we gain a glimpse of His majesty; He is ministered to by the angels of heaven. Then, as the great Forerunner wanes, the Sun of righteousness begins to arise over the coasts of the sea of Galilee, and to those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death a great light arises, as had been written in the Prophets. Now begins the ministry; now the Prophet unfolds before us. The fishermen are called to be fishers of men, and the teaching and preaching and healing are spread abroad over Galilee, and sought by eager multitudes.

Then,—then first,—the Divine Prophet opens His mouth in set discourse, and gives forth the charter law of His Kingdom of Heaven. Not to destroy, but to fulfil; to fill up, and amplify, all

the spiritual aspirations of the Jew; to make men perfect, as their Father is perfect; to purify the heart; to bring in the golden rule of charity, and the blessed calm of holy confidence; to build man's eternal habitation on the rock which He is Himself;—these are the blessed ends for which the Royal Lawgiver is come on earth. And now begins the procession of miracles which attest the divine mission of the Messiah: which testify also to the fact, that He took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses. These are touched for the most part lightly; rather the place of each, in its testimony to Him, being in the Evangelist's view, than minuteness of detail; and they are grouped together without regard, in some cases, to their position in point of time. If we want to know the accurate details of the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, which occurred in the course of that other miracle, we must go to the other two Evangelists for them; if we would arrange the visit to the land of the Gadarenes in its chronological place, it is St. Mark only who will give us the clew: who informs us[1] that it took place on the

[1] See Mark iv. 35.

evening of the same day on which the parables in Matthew xiii. were spoken.

Thus this grouping of incidents together, because of their bearing on a great design, becomes a characteristic of our Evangelist which it is impossible to gainsay; and he who makes even the least use of the Gospels as he ought, becomes aware that he must not look in them for formal chronological annals of the doings and sayings of the Lord; that he is not to be a slave of their letter, but an humble searcher after their spirit.

In continuing this our search, we come next on the call and the commission, first of our Evangelist himself, then of all that chosen band who were nearest to the Lord in His temptations. Here we have that great commission most clearly and fully unfolded; in its present limited foretaste, and in its ultimate world-wide development. It is set before them in all its suffering, and all its glory: in all its privation, and all its rich reward. Close upon it follows the weighty discourse uttered in consequence of the inquiry of the now imprisoned Baptist, 'Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?' In it, our Lord lays forth to the multitudes the distinct characters of His fore-

runner's mission, and of His own, and the capricious treatment which both had met with: and ends by answering the Baptist's question in words found only in this Gospel of the Kingdom, 'Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest:' that is,—'I am He that should come, and none need look for another.' As we pass on, we see something of the conflict and contrast between the hypocritical observance of the letter of the law, and the freedom of the spirit which the new Lawgiver came to bring in: between the malice of His adversaries, and His own peaceful and consoling character as foretold by the prophets: between the power and Kingdom of Satan, and the power and Kingdom of God, of which He was at once the representative and the King, greater than Solomon, greater than Jonah, whose sign is the only one vouchsafed to that sinful and adulterous generation. Yet one more contrast remains: that between earthly and heavenly relationship, declared when His mother and brethren came to speak to Him. Their purpose was to lay hold of Him and put a stop to His ministry, as we learn from St. Mark, but not here, as it is our Evangelist's desire ever to pre-

sent events not in their minute details, but in their bearing on the King, and the Kingdom He came to found.

And now comes a great and mighty change in our Lord's teaching to the people, recorded for us by St. Matthew alone. He had spoken plainly to them in the Sermon on the Mount, and doubtless in many other discourses as He went up and down Galilee. But they had rejected His teaching, plain as it was. From time to time, therefore, He withdrew his plain speaking, and had recourse to a new and hidden method of teaching. The PARABLE was a lesson which might be heard, and yet not heard: heard alike outwardly by all, and yet differently by each, according to his capacity for apprehending spiritual truth. Henceforth the Lord teaches in parables, explaining all in private to His disciples. And of these parables we have the richest collection in the thirteenth chapter of this Gospel. There the whole idea, and progress, and destiny, of the Kingdom of Heaven are unfolded. Its beginnings among men, in the Parable of the Sower: its counterfeits, and their treatment by us, and by God, in that of the Tares: its vast outward extent, from the smallest beginning, in

that of the mustard-seed: its inward purifying and transforming power, in that of the leaven: the two ways in which men find it, one by chance in a field which he gives up all he has to buy, another by search, also giving up all to acquire it when found: and then finally the ultimate destiny of the good and bad in it, in the parable of the draw-net.

With the fourteenth chapter begins the great third division of the Gospel, in which the King, and his Kingdom, and his subjects, come continually more and more into prominence. After the martyrdom of the Forerunner, the Lord retires into a desert place apart, and there miraculously feeds the multitudes who resort to Him, manifesting His wondrous creative power: as He does afterwards His power over the winds and waves, and is worshipped as the Son of God. So wonderful is the virtue of His divine person, that healing influence goes forth from Him over all who so much as touch the hem of His garment.

Again, in the fifteenth chapter, we have an echo, prolonging the pure strain of the Sermon on the Mount, in the Lord's protest against the hypocrisy of those who maintained the tradition of the

elders against truth and righteousness; and, as if in pursuance of the feeling of this discourse, He departs far away, crossing the border of the land of Israel,—and works a work of mercy on one not of the chosen people; returning, however, immediately into Galilee, and betaking Himself to a mountain, where multitudes were brought and laid at his feet to be healed; and the characteristic notice is added, 'They glorified the *God of Israel.*'

Another act of mercy on the assembled multitudes, another note of conflict with the wicked and adulterous generation which tempted Him—by healing a leper, and warning His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and we come to that Confession of Peter, which may be described as the turning-point of the whole great history.

The Lord, knowing all that should come upon Him, and also knowing the hearts of His disciples, is willing to prove them by questioning them as to their views respecting Himself; and thus is educed the great Confession, taught not by flesh and blood, but by inspiration from heaven —'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Thus is laid the foundation: in him who

made this confession, in all who make this confession, in this confession itself, in Him whom this confession acknowledges—'Other foundation can no man lay than that which hath been laid, Jesus the Christ.'

Why was this done? This Evangelist, more fully than the others, gives us the reason—wraps on, one after another, the ever-darkening folds of the cloud of suffering into which, from this time, the King begins to enter.

Now first is made to the apostles the announcement of the Lord's sufferings, and death, and resurrection. 'FROM THAT TIME,' designedly writes St. Matthew, 'Jesus began to show this unto His disciples.' Shortly, but again most characteristically, does our Evangelist touch on the great lesson of self-denial, more expanded in the other Gospels, which followed on the rebuke of Peter. And thus we are brought to the holy Mount—to that vision of glory, and voice of testimony from the Father, which was our Lord's solemn consecration for His coming sufferings, as a like vision of glory, and a like testifying voice, had been His consecration for His ministry.

'St. Peter's inspired confession,' says Mr. West-

cott, 'opens the way to further glimpses of the Kingdom. Yet the earliest manifestation of Christ's glory, like the splendours of the Eastern sky, betokens the coming storm. The announcement of shame and sorrow and death is the introduction to the vision of majesty. The transfiguration of Messiah is connected with the first distinct announcement of His sufferings, with the prospect of His human conflict, and the vindication of His divine right. Thenceforth He speaks more in detail of the citizens of the Kingdom: of their moving principles, obedience, humility, unselfishness, forgiveness; and of their social characteristics, of the rights of marriage as a religious bond, of the duties of wealth as a blessing derived only from God. Yet all claims of merit are excluded. *Many first shall be last.* The warning voice of the parable which closes the section shows that our reward rests in God's good pleasure.'[1] Henceforth, as we advance with the Gospel, the shadow of suffering gathers darker, and the notes of conflict sound shriller and harsher. Yet also the majesty and the Messiahship of Jesus shine out and are recognised more and more. The ambi-

[1] *Study of the Gospels*, p. 337.

tion of the two sons of Zebedee is an occasion, not only of a new warning respecting the baptism of suffering, but also of a new assertion of the dignity of the coming Kingdom. The progress to Jerusalem, the final entry into the vale of suffering, is shone about by glimpses of glory. 'Have mercy on us, thou Son of David,' is the cry of the blind men at Jericho. 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' is the jubilant shout of the multitudes, as they strew the path for the King, and wave their palm branches around Him.

And so sets in that last week of the deepest and intensest interest in all the Saviour's life below. It is full of divine teaching amidst the gathering conflict. This Evangelist of the kingdom gives it to us in far more significant completeness than the others. One by one all His enemies are met and are discomfited, and the time of questioning gives place to the time of conspiring. No longer separately, but all together in assembly, they devise His death. Then follows his awful denunciation of woe upon the 'Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites,' and His final words of sorrowful farewell to Jerusalem, whose children He would often have gathered as a hen

gathers her chickens under her wings, but they would not, and therefore their house is left unto them desolate.

It would be impossible, in a notice of this Gospel, to leave unnoticed the majestic procession of discourses by which the narrative of the Passion is ushered in. The great prophecy on the Mount of Olivet is terminated by a description of the blessedness of the faithful, and the misery of the unfaithful servant at that day when the Lord of both shall come again. And then the discourse proceeds at once to say that, 'At that time,' viz., at the day of the Lord's coming, 'shall the Kingdom of Heaven be likened to ten virgins, five wise and five foolish, going forth to meet the bridegroom.' Here we have gathered up in one the images so frequently used before: the children of the bride-chamber, the King who made a marriage for His Son. After this parable we are introduced into the King's palace, where He is taking account of His own servants; to the judgment, that is, beginning at the house of God. And then follows—like the rest of this grand series, given us by St. Matthew only—the sublime description of the great final judgment: 'THE

KING,' here, and here only by our Lord identified with the '*Son of man*,' sitting on the throne of His glory; before Him all nations gathered, and the division into *blessed* and *cursed* made; and the eternal doom pronounced, according to the presence or the absence of a virtuous life of love to Him in His little ones.

As it is my intention to devote a separate section to the four accounts of the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord, I will not pursue the contents of our Gospel further at present; but will proceed to give the reader the two lists, as before: the one, of passages in which our version differs from the best authenticated reading of the original text, or there occurs in that text a doubtful reading which the English reader ought to know; the other, of words or phrases not accurately rendered from the original.

To the former belong the following:—In ch. i. 25, our oldest MSS. have, instead of '*her firstborn son*,' 'a son.' In ch. v. 22, the words '*without a cause*' are omitted in very many of the ancient authorities, and are expressly pronounced spurious by Jerome and Augustine, and ought *probably* to be expunged. But the ancient authorities are much divided.

Such disputed passages ought in common fairness to be known to the readers of the English Bible. In ch. v. 27, '*by them of old time*' should be omitted. In ver. 44, the words '*bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you*,' and the words '*despitefully use you, and*' should be omitted. In ver. 47, for '*publicans so*,' substitute 'Gentiles the same.' In ch. vi. 1, '*alms*' ought to be 'righteousness;' but not in ver. 2. The first verse is a general caution, which is afterwards divided into particular ones. In ch. vi. 12, '*we forgive*' ought to be 'we have forgiven.' In ver. 13, the Lord's prayer ought to end with the word 'evil.' The doxology, '*For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory*,' is omitted by all our most ancient MSS, and by the Greek Fathers, even when they expounded the prayer in detail. It is stated by one of them to have been added by Church authorities; and probably from being used in the liturgies it found its way into the sacred text. At the end of ver. 18, omit '*openly*.' In ch. viii. 15, for '*ministered unto them*,' read 'ministered unto him.' In ch. viii. 28, '*Gergesenès*' should most probably be 'Gadarenes.' In ch. ix. 13, end, omit the words '*to repentance*.' In ver. 36, for '*fainted*,'

read 'were harassed.' In ch. x. 4, for '*Canaanite*,' read 'Cananæan.' This is of some importance. The name 'Cananæan' signifies *a zealot*, and is equivalent to the appellation *Zelotes*, which is affixed to the name of this Simon in both St. Luke's lists of the Apostles. This has, from ignorance, been confounded with the word '*Canaanite*,' which is a national appellation. In ch. xi. 2, instead of '*two of*' (*duo*) all our most ancient authorities have 'by means of' (*dia*). In ch. xii. 6, for '*one greater*,' read 'that which is greater.' In ch. xiii. 55, for '*Joses*,' the right reading is probably 'Joseph;' some MSS. have 'John.' In ch. xvii. 4, for '*let us make*,' read 'I will make.' In ch. xix. 17, for '*Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God*,' read 'Why askest thou me concerning good? There is One good.'[1] In ver. 20 the words, '*from my youth up*' should in all probability be omitted. In ch. xx. 7, omit '*and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive*:' as also the words '*and* (*to*) *be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with*,' in verses 22, 23.

[1] Compare this notice with what will hereafter be said on the parallel passage in St. Luke. It is one of those places where the texts of the three Gospels, originally slightly differing in expression, have been in later times assimilated to one another.

These last have been inserted here from the parallel place in St. Mark, ch. x. 38, 39. In ch. xxi. 13, for '*have made*,' read 'are making.' In ch. xxii. 7, for '*But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth*,' read 'But the king was wroth.' In ver. 23, for '*which say*,' read 'saying.' They said it then and there, not only commonly. Ch. xxiii. 14 should be altogether omitted; it is wanting in all our most ancient MSS., and has been inserted here from Mark xii. 40, Luke xx. 47. In ch. xxiv. 7, '*and pestilences*' is omitted in most of our ancient MSS. In ver. 42, '*hour*' should be 'day.' In ch. xxv. 3, instead of '*They that were foolish took their lamps, and took*,' read 'For the foolish, when they took their lamps, took.' In ch. xxvi. 3, the words '*and the scribes*' are omitted by all our most ancient MSS. In ver. 42, our Lord's words should stand, 'if this may not pass away, except I drink it.' In ver. 60, it should stand, 'but found none, even though many false witnesses came.' In ch. xxvii. 64, the words '*by night*' should be omitted; they are not in any of our most ancient MSS. In ch. xxviii. 9, the words '*as they went to tell his disciples*,' should most probably be omitted.

The second list, of some of the principal passages and words wrongly or inadequately rendered by our translators, is as follows :—

In ch. ii. 16, '*coasts*' should be 'borders.'[1] In ch. iii. 7, '*generation*' should be 'offspring.'[2] In ch. iv. 5, '*a* pinnacle' should be 'the pinnacle' (it was probably the point of Herod's portico). In ch. iv. 12, '*cast into prison*' should be 'delivered up.' In ch. v. 9, it should be 'shall be called sons of God;' and in ver. 45, '*the children*' should be 'sons.' In ch. vi. 23, '*how great is that darkness*' ought to be 'how dark is the darkness;' *i.e.*, if the eye, which is the *light* of the body, be dark, how dark must the rest be, which is of itself not light, but naturally dark. In verses 25, 27, 28, 31, 34, and in ch. x. 19, '*thought*' should be 'anxious thought,' which is the real meaning of the word in the original: our present version is liable to be misunderstood. In ch. viii. 12, '*children*' should be 'sons;'[3] in ver. 16, '*his word*' should be 'a word;' and in ver. 24, '*was covered*' should have been 'was being covered.' In ch. x. 39, '*findeth*' should be 'hath found;' and '*loseth*'

[1] So also in ch. xv. 21, 22; xix. 1.
[2] So also in ch. xii. 34; xxiii. 33.
[3] So also in ch. ix. 15; xii. 27; xiii. 38; xxiii. 15, 31.

should be 'hath lost.' In ch. xi. 7, '*see*' should be 'gaze upon;' it is not the same word as that rightly rendered '*see*' in verses 8 and 9. In ver. 14, '*was for to come*' ought to be 'shall come.' In ver. 19, for '*is justified*,' substitute 'was justified.' In ver. 27, '*are delivered*' ought to stand 'were delivered.' In ver. 27, the meaning is made clearer if, instead of '*will* reveal him' we give the word in the original its full meaning, 'is minded to reveal him.' In ch. xii. 21, '*trust*' ought to be 'hope.' In ch. xii. 24, there is in the original no term of opprobrium corresponding to '*fellow*;' it is simply 'This man.' The same is the case in ch. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 47. In ch. xii. 31, '*against the Holy Ghost*' ought to be 'of the Spirit.' In verses 41, 42, it should stand, 'there is more than Jonas here,' 'there is more than Solomon here.' In ch. xiii. 19, it should stand, 'This is he which was sown by the way side;' and in ver. 20, 'He that was sown upon the stony places;' and in verses 22, 23, for '*received seed into*, or *among*,' 'was sown upon, or among.' In xiv. 26, '*a spirit*' should be 'an apparition.'[1] In ch. xv. 5, the saying should stand, 'That wherein

[1] See on Mark vi. 49, page 48.

thou mightest have been benefited by me, is a gift [to God]; [he is free], and shall not honour his father or his mother.' In ch. xv. 27, '*yet*' should be 'for ever;' and in ver. 32, '*will not*,' 'am not willing to.' In ch. xvi. 22, '*Be it far from thee*' should have been kept, as in the original, 'God be gracious to thee.' In ver. 26, '*soul*' (both times) ought to be 'life.' In ch. xviii. 12, it should stand 'doth not he leave the ninety and nine upon the mountain, and goeth and seeketh.' In ch. xix. 10, '*good*' should be 'expedient;' and in ver. 23, '*hardly*' should be 'with difficulty.' In ch. xx. 14, '*I will give*' should have been more clearly expressed, 'it is my will to give.' In ch. xxi. 33, where our present text has, '*went into a far country*,' the original has only 'left his home.'[1] In ch. xxiii. 6, for '*uppermost rooms*,' substitute 'uppermost place.' In ver. 10, 'Neither be ye called leaders; for one is your leader.' Ver. 24, 'straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel.' In ver. 26, for '*that which is within*' (the contents), substitute 'the inside of.' Ch. xxiv. 12, 13, should stand, 'And because iniquity hath abounded, the love of the many shall wax

[1] See also in ch. xxv. 14.

cold. But he that hath endured,' etc. Ch. xxiv. 32, 'Now learn the parable from the fig-tree: When now his branch becometh tender.' Ver. 36, '*no man*' should be 'none.' In ch. xxv. 8, not '*gone out*,' but 'going out.' In ch. xxv. 46, either 'everlasting' or 'eternal' should be used in both places—the word is the same in both. In ch. xxvi. 5, '*on the feast day*' should be 'during the feast.' In ver. 35, '*Though I should die*' ought to be 'Though I must die,' 'even if it be necessary for me to die.' In ver. 64, '*Hereafter*' should be 'Henceforth.' In ch. xxvii. 9, '*valued*,' and '*value*,' should for perspicuity be 'set a price on:' and in ver. 10, for the same reason, '*appointed me*' should be 'commanded me.' In ver. 44, the strange expression, '*cast the same in his teeth*,' has nothing to correspond to it in the original. It is, 'In like manner did the thieves also revile him, which were crucified with him.' In the next verse, '*all the land*' should be 'all the earth.' In ver. 50, it should stand, 'yield up his spirit.' In ver. 56, '*Zebedee's children*' should be 'the sons of Zebedee,' viz., the two well-known Apostles. Ver. 66 should end, 'sealing the stone, besides posting the guard.' In ch. xxviii. 3, '*countenance*' should

be 'appearance;' in ver. 19, '*teach*' should be 'make disciples of:' and in ver. 20, '*alway*' should be 'all the days.'

The Gospel of St. Matthew is that one to which we owe, more than to any other, our complete idea of our Blessed Lord as the promised Messiah, the Holy One of God, the King and Head over all to His Church. In the vivid depictions of St. Mark, we have ever His personal image before us, and the very sound of His voice: in the careful and precious collections of St. Luke, we see Him as the Saviour of our race, the Head and Root of our humanity: while it is from this first and best known of the Gospels that that image of Him especially arises, which is so much in the thoughts and hearts of all of us who believe—that Chosen One, in whom centre all the ways and works of God: perfect in Majesty, perfect in Mercy: the King's Son, for whom is made the great marriage of heaven and earth: the Bridegroom, into whose feast the wise and virgin souls shall enter: the King himself, who shall come to take account of His own servants: nay, who shall come, and all the holy angels with him, and sit on the throne of His glory, with all the nations

before Him, and allot to every one his eternal doom.

Reader, would you use this Gospel aright? Seek ever this thy King and Saviour in it: and mayest thou find Him more and more, to thy soul's everlasting health.

IV.

THE THREE—ST. LUKE.

'LUKE, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you.' Thus wrote St. Paul, from his prison at Rome to the Colossians. 'Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world. . . . Only Luke is with me.' Thus he wrote, some years after, when he was now ready to be offered up, and the time of his departure was at hand, to his '*child*' Timotheus.

And the faithful companion was also the faithful narrator. Twice did he take in hand to give an account of the things which were fulfilled, and fully received, among Christians: the first time, to record the birth and ministry of our Lord: the second time, to chronicle the chief events which befel the Church, from the ascension to the imprisonment of St. Paul. The Church owes to

St. Luke more of the knowledge of the events of Redemption, and of the whole course of our Lord, than to any other Evangelist: and she owes to him entirely her knowledge of the history of the Primitive Church. His Gospel alone contains any account of the parentage and birth of the Lord's Forerunner. His Gospel alone relates the joyful details of the birth of the Lord Himself. From this Gospel alone we have the Christian hymns of Zacharias the father of John the Baptist, of the Virgin Mary, and of the aged Simeon, all of them for ages familiarized to Christians by their use in the services of the Church. From St. Luke alone have we the narrative of our Lord's circumcision, and of His presentation in the Temple. Were it not for St. Luke, we should know absolutely nothing of those thirty years which He passed in obscurity before the commencement of His ministry; but now we have that most touching and beautiful history of His visit at twelve years old to the Temple, and we know that after it He went down to Nazareth and was subject unto his parents. Moreover, we have from this, which has been well called the Gospel of our Lord's Humanity, the precious and wonderful testimony, that Jesus 'in-

creased in wisdom as in stature, and in favour with God and man.'

Universality, again, is throughout a characteristic of this Gospel. Christ is not the Messiah of the Jew only: He is the Desire of all nations. His genealogy traces Him not from Abraham only, as that of St. Matthew, but is carried up to the first man, who owned no parent but God. Another characteristic is, the habit of relating His acts of mercy and love, and His words by which mercy and love are prescribed. Here alone we have the touching scene at the gate of Nain, where the Lord poured joy into the bereaved heart of the widow: here also the healing of the woman with the spirit of infirmity, and of the man with the dropsy; here alone the cleansing of the ten lepers; here alone the fact that our Lord touched the ear of Malchus and healed him.

And in the reports of the words of Jesus, it is the same. St. Luke only of the Evangelists gives us the parable of the two debtors, going down to the very depths of the source of human love: St. Luke alone that of the good Samaritan, which teaches us to widen our charities and extend the service of self-denying love to all: St. Luke alone,

the friend at midnight, teaching us the duty and sure success of holy importunity in prayer. Nor is our rich catalogue nearly complete. To this Evangelist we owe our knowledge of the gracious intercession for the barren fig-tree, so full of warning and of comfort; and it is he only who has given that gem of all the collections of parables, the three in his fifteenth chapter—the best possible commentary on the Lord's own declaration of His mission, that He came to seek and to save *that which was lost.* Whether the lost one be silly and deceived, as the sheep that strayed,—or all unconscious of his noble lineage and divine stamp, as the lost piece of money,—or recreant in conscious rebellion, as the lost prodigal,—there is a Shepherd to go in search of him, there is One who will light a candle and seek him even in the dust of death, there is a gracious Father who will come to meet and welcome the returning penitent, and feast him with his pardoning love.

Nor have we yet done with the holy lessons of grace and mercy which this faithful collector of the Lord's sayings has handed down to us. Wisdom is taught us by the parable of the unjust steward, —Christian prudence, to be as diligent for our

undying interests, as the world's children are for their temporary ones: distrust of man's judgment and of self-exalting thoughts, by the story of the Pharisee and publican. O how deeply comforting is that blessed assurance, that he who could do nothing but smite on his breast and cry for mercy on him the sinner, went down to his house *justified!* How sweet an echo there is here of the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, for which St. Luke's great companion, himself in his own estimation 'the chief of sinners,' argued and toiled.

But I forgot, as we passed on, that we owe also to this Evangelist alone the strange and wonderful glimpse into the secret realms beyond the grave, afforded in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. And here again how full of comfort is the history for the poor and needy and afflicted. Full of comfort again is that other parable of the unjust judge, moved at last to do right by the simple importunity of the oppressed widow. If unrighteous man can thus against his bent be moved by the pleading of justice, how much more shall He who hateth iniquity regard the prayers of His elect.

And if we recur again for a while to *facts*, how numerous and how characteristic, in the sense already mentioned, are those which we learn from St. Luke alone. First, as first in importance also, comes the visit of our Lord to the synagogue at Nazareth. Here the character of His great mission is at once, from His own lips, declared to us. He was anointed 'to preach the Gospel (to declare glad tidings, that is) to the poor; sent to heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.' All is mercy and tender compassion; all wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth. And as these words go on, their bearing has the *universality* which so characterizes this Gospel. Elisha was sent only to a Sidonian widow: the only leper cleansed was a Syrian captain.

Here too only, we read of that first miraculous draught of fishes, symbolizing the universality of the future Church. Here alone we learn of the ministering women who accompanied the Lord through Galilee, as He preached and showed the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. 'The

Teacher,' says Mr. Westcott, 'who included in his church the humble, the distressed, and the repentant, is attended by the weak and loving, rather than by a council of elders, a band of warriors, or a school of prophets.'

The contents of nine whole chapters, from chapter ix. 51 to xviii. 14, are peculiar to St. Luke. They embrace the narrative of the Lord's last great journey to Jerusalem, with all its collateral incidents and sayings. Besides what has been already mentioned, they contain the following histories, found, of course, here only:—the over-zeal of the sons of Zebedee, James and John, and its rebuke; the mission of the seventy; the visit to Martha and Mary in Galilee, and their characters. As we advance, the same wealth of special details continues, and the same spirit prevails in their selection. He who received publicans and sinners now condescends to become the guest of the publican Zacchæus. It is here alone that we have that remarkable scene on the way to Jerusalem, which begins with the multitude of the disciples rejoicing and praising God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen, and ends with the Lord's tears over the rebellious city. Mr.

Westcott notices that this triumphant song of the band of disciples is the echo of the angelic song at the nativity, the *gloria in excelsis* being found in both.

As I said in my last section, I abstain at present from comparing the narratives of the Passion. But I cannot help noticing, because it belongs eminently to the character of St. Luke's Gospel, that it is in his narrative alone that we find mention of the agony and bloody sweat, and the ministration of the angel comforter; of the Lord turning, and looking upon Peter; of the part which Herod bore in the events of the Lord's trial; of the great company of the people who followed Him as He went to crucifixion, and His memorable speech to the daughters of Jerusalem; of the prayer for the Gentile soldiers who were nailing Him to the cross; of the penitent thief,—by which incident, besides its wonderful revelation of tender mercy and grace in the dying Saviour, we obtain another glimpse within the veil into the mysterious world of spirits. Here only we are told that 'all the people who came together to that sight, beholding the things that were done, smote their breasts, and returned,' and that 'all

his acquaintance, and the women that followed Him from Galilee, stood afar off beholding these things.'

And most precious is the concluding chapter; full of new and deep interest. The journey to Emmaus, with its touching and kindling incidents, making our hearts burn, as it did theirs; the appearance to Simon; the proofs of Christ's glorified Humanity; the opening of the disciples' understandings that they might understand the Scriptures, with the assurance that thus it behoved the Christ to suffer and to fulfil all things that were written in the law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Him; and then the assurance that repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem,—all these break upon the reader of St. Matthew and St. Mark now for the first time.

And in the narratives of the Ascension, be it remembered that St. Luke stands alone. He only relates to us the manner of its happening, and that in two separate accounts. The previous Gospels had made no mention of it: the short notice occurring in the apostolic fragment at the

end of St. Mark apparently not being due to that Evangelist himself.

Notice how St. Luke, in ending his Gospel, prepares the way for his second treatise: 'Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem till ye be endued with power from on high.'

And the Gospel ends also with joy, and the glory of the exalted Son of God: 'they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God.' 'The Gospel of the Saviour,' says Mr. Westcott, 'begins with hymns and ends with praises: as the thanksgivings of the meek are recorded in the first chapter, so in the last we listen to the gratitude of the faithful.'

A few peculiarities may be mentioned, which will still further illustrate the gracious and the universal character already given of our Gospel.

Notice the addition—after ch. iii. 4, 5, which give the preaching of the Baptist as described by the other Evangelists—of ver. 6: 'And ALL FLESH shall see the salvation of God.'

St. Luke alone of the Three (I do not now speak of St. John) uses the title '*Saviour*' for our Lord

(ch. i. 47, ii. 11), and '*salvation*' for that blessing which He came to bring (ch. i. 69, 71, 77; ii. 30; iii. 6; xix. 9).

Notice, as bearing on our Lord's Humanity, the words in ch. vi. 12, '*and (He) continued all night in prayer to God.*'

St. Luke alone of the Three uses the well-known word '*charis*,' *grace* or *favour* or *thanks*: it occurs eight times in the Gospel, ch. i. 30; ii. 40, 52; iv. 22; vi. 32, 33, 34; xvii. 9.

Where he follows the course of the oral apostolic narrative, and coincides with the sequence of events related by the other two, additions are constantly found, and some of them of a very interesting kind. For instance, in the account of the Baptist's preaching, the different classes of hearers are specified, and that which was said to each. In ch. iv. 1, we are told that our Lord, when He was led up into the wilderness to be tempted, was '*full of the Holy Spirit*;' and in ver. 13, we are told that the baffled tempter '*departed from him for a season*' only. In iv. 43, we have the saying of our Lord, '*I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I sent.*' In vi. 8, we have the important addition, '*he knew their*

thoughts.' In vii. 21, we have the interesting supplement to St. Matthew's narrative, that when the messengers of John came to our Lord, '*in the same hour He cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits: and to many that were blind He gave sight.*' In the middle of our Lord's discourse on that occasion, we have the interesting notice inserted (vii. 29, 30) respecting the effect produced on the various classes of hearers.

A most instructive point of comparison between the three Gospels is furnished by the narrative of the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, which happened as our Lord was on the way to the house of Jairus. Had we only the short and summary account of St. Matthew, we certainly should derive a totally different impression of what took place, from that which we now have. But that is no fault of the narrative. It states the simple facts, and tells the strict truth, though not in the strictest manner. But it does not tell what the two other Evangelists do, that our Lord stopped and inquired after the woman, and that she came trembling and fell down before Him, and told Him what had happened. Compare again these two fuller accounts, and see how characteristically

they differ. St. Mark gives us the minute details, that the woman *had suffered many things of many physicians, and grew no better, but rather had become worse,*—that she *had heard of Jesus,*—that she *came in the crowd behind,*—that she *knew in her body that she was healed from her plague,*—that *Jesus turned round in the crowd,*—and *looked round to see her that had done this thing;* that the woman told Him all the truth. Turn now to the account of St. Luke. Here we have nearly the same particular account as in St. Mark, with the omission of the minute touches above noticed; but the statements are more such as would have been made by a physician. '*She had spent all her livelihood on physicians, and could not be healed by any.*' '*Immediately her issue of blood stanched.*' And we have one additional graphic detail—that she told Him *before all the people.* The overflowing of His mercy and the sense of His omniscience had turned her timidity into boldness.

In the narrative of the Transfiguration (chap. ix. 29) we learn from St. Luke that it was *as Jesus prayed* that the fashion of His countenance was altered So we read that He was *praying* at his baptism (chap. iii. 21), when the Holy Ghost de-

scended on Him. So, too, as before noticed, in chap. vi. 12, that *He continued all night in prayer to God.* So in chap. xi. 1, that His disciples came and besought Him to *teach them to pray.* Truly, this is in an especial manner the Gospel of prayer and of grace.

Here, too, in this same narrative, we learn what it was on which the Three glorified Ones conversed on the holy mount: *His decease, which He should accomplish at Jerusalem.* Thus does the incident of the Transfiguration acquire a holy significance in our Lord's history, which we should not otherwise have been able to attach to it. He is now passing into the shadow of His Passion, and the blessed glorified ones are permitted to come and solace His human soul with mention of the sufferings He was to undergo, and the glory which should follow. The Transfiguration is the gilded edge of that dark cloud, into which the Son of God was entering for our sakes.

And how deep the pathos of that which follows after the wondrous narrative! '*While they wondered every one at all things which Jesus did, He said unto His disciples, Let these sayings sink down*

into your ears: for the Son of Man shall be delivered into the hands of men.'

I pass over many minor additions, leaving them for the intelligent reader to discover in his own comparison of the Gospels.

In our Lord's great prophetic discourse, at the end of His ministry, given by all the three, St. Luke inserts some most interesting sayings of His, not elsewhere repeated. '*They* (the Jewish people) *shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, till the time of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled.*' It is a strange feature of the impudent folly (really one can call it by no other name) of modern unbelief, that it should take upon it to pronounce, on account of this passage, that this Gospel was *not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem.*

At the end of this great discourse, we gain this valuable information respecting the way in which our Lord spent the important week preceding the Passion: '*In the day-time He was teaching in the temple: and at night He went out, and abode in the mount that is called the Mount of Olives. And all*

the people came early in the morning to Him, for to hear Him.'

It may be known to some of my readers, that Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill, has published an excellent little treatise on the voyage and shipwreck of St. Paul. We shall have occasion to speak more of his labours, and their complete and decisive success, when we come to our chapter on the Acts of the Apostles. But they somewhat concern us now also. Mr. Smith has been led, in examining into the use of nautical terms in that narrative, to the inquiry, what was St. Luke's own position in regard to acquaintance with the sea. He has carefully considered the Evangelist's use of sea terms, and has found reason to believe that he was, though not himself a seaman, yet a landsman, thoroughly versed in sea matters, and taking most accurate account of what he saw. It is very probable that he was a native of Antioch, a city which had great commerce at sea, by means of its port Seleucia. There is a remarkable reading in the Cambridge MS. at Acts xi. 27, 28, which would make him present at Antioch long before he became the companion of St. Paul. The passage in that MS. runs thus: '*And in these days*

came down prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there was great rejoicing: and when we were gathered together, one of them named Agabus, said,' etc. And Augustine, writing nearly two hundred years before the probable date of this MS., quotes the words as above.

Mr. Smith has also shown that St. Luke was a most diligent and accurate observer, and thus describes his style: 'The style of St. Luke as an historian is clear, animated, and picturesque. This last attribute is, of course, most obvious when he describes scenes which fell under his own observation, but it is not confined to them. It distinguishes his descriptions in the Gospel also. . . . Combined with these excellences we find the total want of anything like display or attempt at fine writing; his sole object being to convey the truth to his readers, not to enhance his literary reputation.'

I proceed now to give my readers two lists of matters to be corrected in their English Bibles, similar to those which have accompanied my other papers.

The first will be of those places in this Gospel where the reading adopted in our English version

is not that of our most ancient authorities. I shall also insert notices of some remarkable variations in particular manuscripts.

In ch. i. 28, the words, '*Blessed art thou among women,*' are not found in our two most ancient MSS., the Sinaitic and the Vatican. In all probability they owe their insertion in the text to increasing reverence for the mother of our Lord after those MSS. were written. In ver. 29, '*when she saw him*' should be omitted. In ver. 35, '*of thee*' should be omitted.

In ch. ii. 14, '*on earth peace, good-will toward men,*' should be 'on earth peace among men of good pleasure.' Thus it stands in all our most ancient MSS., the Sinaitic, Vatican, Alexandrine, Cambridge: the meaning being, not, as the Roman Catholics read it, '*men of good-will,*' '*those that like it,*' but 'men of God's good pleasure,' —'the elect people of God:' for such is the New Testament sense of the word used. It occurs eight times more, and in six of the places it signifies *God's pleasure:* Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21; Eph. i. 5, 9; Phil. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11. In ver. 22, '*her* purification' ought to be 'their purification:' so read all the MSS. except the Cambridge,

which has '*his* purification.' In ver. 33, '*Joseph and his mother*,' should be 'his father and mother:' so our most ancient MSS. and the express testimony of Origen in the third century. In ver. 40, omit '*in spirit*.'

In ch. iv. 4, the words, '*but by every word of God*,' are not found in our most ancient MSS.: and the same read the beginning of ver. 5, 'And taking him up, he showed him,' etc. In ver. 8, instead of '*Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written*,' read simply, 'It is written.' The rest has been added from St. Matthew iv. 10, and is not in the most ancient MSS. In ver. 18, omit the words, '*to heal the broken-hearted*.' They have been inserted from the place in Isaiah.[1] In ver. 41, omit '*Christ*.' In ver. 44, instead of '*Galilee*,' the great majority of our ancient authorities have 'Judæa.'

In ch. v. 33, omit '*Why do*,' and read the verse as an assertion. In ver. 38, omit '*and both are preserved*:' and in the next verse omit '*straightway*,' and instead of '*better*,' read 'good,' *i.e.*, good enough.

In ch. vi. 1, our most ancient copies omit the

[1] This ought to have been noticed in my *New Testament for English Readers*, but was overlooked.

words 'second . . . after the first,' reading only 'on the Sabbath.' It might possibly be the difficulty of the description of the particular Sabbath, which occasioned the omission. The '*second after the first*' has never yet received any satisfactory interpretation. Instead of ver. 5 of this chapter (which it inserts after ver. 10), the Cambridge MS. has these remarkable words: '*On the same day he beheld a certain man working on the Sabbath, and said unto him, O man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou: but if thou knowest not, accursed, and a transgressor of the law.*' In ver. 25, instead of '*full*,' read 'full now.' In ver. 36, omit '*therefore*.' In ver. 48, instead of '*for it was founded upon a rock*,' read 'because it was well built.'

In ch. vii. 19, for '*Jesus*,' read 'the Lord.' In ver. 31, the words, '*and the Lord said*,' are omitted by all the principal MSS.

In ch. viii. 3, '*him*' ought to be 'them.' In ver. 37, '*the country of the Gadarenes round about*' should be, 'the country round about the Gerasenes.' In ver. 48, omit '*be of good comfort*' (probably inserted from Matt. ix. 22). In ver. 54. '*put them all out, and*' should be omitted.

In ch. ix. 1, '*his twelve disciples*' should be 'the twelve.' In ver. 7, '*by him*' should be omitted. In ver. 10, instead of '*into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida*,' it should stand 'to a city called Bethsaida.' In ver. 35, instead of '*beloved*,' read, with our most ancient MSS., 'chosen.' In ver. 48, for '*shall be*,' read 'is.' In ver. 54, the words '*even as Elias did*' are omitted in some of our oldest MSS.: and in the next two verses, the words, '*and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them*,' are omitted by all our most ancient MSS. On the other hand, they are contained in the oldest versions, and quoted by very ancient writers. It is one of those doubtful places that probably will never be cleared up altogether.

In ch. x. 15, it should stand, 'And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be thrust down to hell.' In ver. 19, '*give*' should be 'have given.' In ver. 20, omit '*rather*.' In ver. 21, for 'rejoiced *in spirit*,' read, with almost all the most ancient authorities, 'rejoiced in the Holy Spirit.' In ver. 39, for '*Jesus' feet*,' read 'the Lord's feet.'

In ch. xi. 2-4, the Lord's prayer stands thus in the most ancient MSS. : 'Father, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come: give us day by day our daily bread: and forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation.' This shorter form has been, in later MSS., filled in and altered from St. Matthew. It is to be noticed that several of the early fathers state, that St. Luke, instead of '*thy kingdom come*,' wrote 'let thy Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us.' In ver. 44, omit '*Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites.*' In ver. 48, the words '*their sepulchres*' are omitted in the most ancient MSS. In ver. 53, instead of '*as he said these things unto them*,' read, 'when he was gone out:' and in the next verse, the most ancient MSS. read, 'laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth:' omitting all the rest.

In ch. xii. 15, for '*covetousness*,' read 'all covetousness.' In ver. 31, omit '*all.*'

In ch. xiii. 15, '*thou hypocrite*' should be 'ye hypocrites.' In ver. 24, '*the strait gate*' should be 'the narrow door.' In ver. 31, for '*the same day*,' read 'in that hour.' In ver. 35, omit '*desolate*,' and '*verily.*'

In ch. xiv. 3, after 'Sabbath-day,' add, 'or not?' In ver. 5, instead of '*an ass or an ox*,' should be read, 'a son, or an ox.' In ver. 34, read, 'Salt therefore is good; but if even the salt,' etc.

In ch. xv. 22, after 'Bring forth,' add 'quickly.'

In ch. xvi. 9, for '*when ye fail*,' read, 'when it fails.' In ver. 25, read, 'he is comforted here, and,' etc.

In ch. xvii. 3, read, 'If thy brother sin, rebuke him.' In ver. 9, omit '*I trow not.*' Omit ver. 36 altogether. It is wanting in almost all our older MSS.

In ch. xix. 45, the words '*and them that bought*' should be erased: they are not found in the most ancient MSS., and Origen, in the third century, says in his commentary, that we are told Jesus drove out the sellers, but not the buyers.

In ch. xx. 30, omit '*took her to wife, and he died childless.*'

In ch. xxi. 4, omit '*of God;*' and in ver. 8, omit '*therefore.*' In ver. 25, all the most ancient MSS. and versions have 'distress of nations in despair at the roaring of the sea and the waves.' In ver. 36, instead of 'may be accounted worthy,' many ancient MSS. read, 'may be able.'

111047

In ch. xxii., verses 43, 44 are wanting in the Vatican MS., and in some other of our most ancient authorities; but they are found in the Sinaitic and Cambridge MSS., and in the most ancient versions, and are quoted in the writings of the earliest fathers, Justin Martyr and Irenæus, both in the second century. There need, therefore, be no reasonable doubt of their genuineness. In ver. 64, '*struck him on the face, and*' should be omitted.

In ch. xxiii. 8, omit '*many things.*' Ver. 17 is omitted by the Alexandrine and Vatican MSS., and many ancient authorities, but contained in the Sinaitic and Cambridge MSS., and in many ancient versions. In ver. 35, instead of '*the Christ, the chosen of God,*' read 'the Christ of God, the chosen [One],'—or, the 'chosen Christ of God:' either way, keeping the words 'Christ of God' together. In ver. 39, for '*If thou be Christ,*' read, 'Art thou not the Christ?' In ver. 42, for '*he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me,*' read, 'he said, Jesus, remember me.' In ver. 51, '*also himself*' should be omitted.

In ch. xxiv. 1, '*and certain others with them*' should be omitted. In ver. 17, our two oldest

MSS., the Sinaitic and the Vatican, have, 'as ye walk? And they stood looking sad.' This also was apparently the reading of the Alexandrine MS., but there has been an erasure. The Cambridge MS. has 'as ye walk sadly?' which, perhaps, was the original text. In ver. 42, the words, 'and of an honeycomb,' are omitted by almost all the most ancient MSS. and fathers, but they are found in the ancient Syriac version, and hardly could have been an interpolation. In ver. 46, read, 'Thus it is written, that Christ should suffer, and should rise,' etc. In ver. 49, omit the words, '*of Jerusalem.*' In ver. 51, the words, 'and carried up into heaven,' are omitted in the Sinaitic and the Cambridge MSS., but contained in all the others. Both this omission and that in ver. 42 may be accounted for by the eye of the copyist passing from 'and' to 'and,' a very common source of omissions in our MSS.

I next give the list of the principal passages in this Gospel where the rendering in our authorized version does not faithfully represent the original, or where it may be made more perspicuous for the English reader.

In ch. i. ver. 1, '*declaration* of,' should be 'nar-

ration concerning.' In ver. 3, '*had perfect understanding of*,' should be 'traced down accurately.' In ver. 4, it should be, 'those sayings wherein thou wert instructed.' In ver. 48, '*shall call me blessed*,' means merely, 'shall congratulate me,' or 'account me happy.' In ver. 59, for '*called*,' substitute 'were calling,' *i.e.*, 'intended to call.'

In ch. ii. 1, 2, 3, 5, for '*taxed*' and '*taxing*,' read 'enrolled' and 'enrolment.' In ver. 10, '*all people*' ought to be 'all the people,' *i.e.*, of Israel. In ver. 12, '*the babe*' should be 'a babe.' In ver. 19 it should stand, 'kept all these words, pondering them,' etc. In ver. 33, '*of him*' had better, for perspicuity, be 'concerning him.' In ver. 35 it should be, 'that reasonings out of many hearts may be revealed.' In ver. 38, 'she coming in at the same hour.' In ver. 40, '*filled*' should rather be 'becoming filled.' In ver. 43, '*child*' should be 'boy' or 'lad;' up to this time '*child*' has been used, but this is another term. In ver. 49, '*about my Father's business*' should be 'among my Father's matters.' It may even be rendered 'in my Father's house.' In ver. 52, 'wisdom and stature' may also be rendered 'wisdom as well as age.'

Ch. iii. 7 should begin 'He said therefore;'

and '*generation*' ought to be 'offspring.' In ver. 23, for '*began to be about thirty years of age*,' substitute 'was about thirty years of age when He began (his ministry).'

In ch. iv. 9 (as in Matt. iv. 5), for '*a* pinnacle,' read 'the pinnacle.'

In ch. v. 6, for '*their net brake*,' it should be 'their nets were bursting.' In ver. 22, '*thoughts*' should be 'reasonings,' as before and after. In ver. 34, '*children*' should be 'sons;' so also in ch. vi. 35; ch. xvi. 8 (twice).

In ch. vi. 11, for '*madness*,' read 'folly.' The word cannot mean *madness*. In ver. 15, '*the son*' is not expressed in the original, nor is '*the brother*,' in ver. 16: nor '*the mother*,' in ch. xxiv. 10. In ver. 17, for '*in the plain*,' read 'upon a level place;' for '*the company*,' 'a multitude;' and for '*multitude of people*,' 'number of the people.' In ver. 19, for '*virtue*' substitute 'power:' so also in ch. viii. 46. In ver. 20, 'Blessed *be*' should be 'Blessed *are:*' it is not a pronouncing them blessed, but a declaration of the fact of their blessedness. In ver. 48, the right rendering is, 'he is like a man building an house, who digged, and went deep.'

In ch. vii. 5, read 'and himself built us our synagogue.' In ver. 24, '*people*' should be 'multitudes,' as in Matt. xi. 7, where the same word is used in the original; and '*see*' should be 'gaze upon.' It is a different word from that in verses 25, 26, where 'see' is right. In ver. 30, '*against*' ought to be 'towards.'

In ch. viii. 4, for '*come*,' read 'coming.' In ver. 19, for '*press*,' 'multitude.' In ver. 29, for '*had commanded*,' 'was commanding.' In the same verse (as also in ch. ix. 42), '*the devil*' does not mean Satan personally, but *the dæmon which possessed him*. In ver. 33, '*a steep place*' should be 'the precipice.' In ver. 40, '*gladly*' is not in the original. In ver. 44, '*border*' should be 'hem,' as in Matt. ix. 20.

In ch. ix. 32, instead of '*And when they were awake*,' it should be 'but having kept awake.' The authorized version implies that they *fell asleep;* the sacred text asserts the contrary. In ver. 43, for '*mighty power*,' read 'majesty;' and, in ver. 45, for '*that they perceived it not*,' 'that they might not perceive it.' Verse 51 should run, 'And it came to pass, as the days of his receiving up were being accomplished, he himself,' etc.

In ch. x. 22, for '*will* reveal him,' read 'is pleased to reveal him.'

In ch. xi. 8, for '*importunity*,' read 'shamelessness.' In ver. 12, '*offer*' ought to be 'give;' it is the same word as in ver. 11. In ver. 13, '*your heavenly Father*' should be 'the Father from heaven.' In verses 31, 32, it should stand, 'there is more than Solomon here.' . . . 'there is more than Jonas here.' In ver. 34, it should be, 'The candle of the body is the eye;' the word used is the same as in verse 33.

The latter part of ch. xii. 15 should stand, 'For not because a man hath abundance, doth his life consist in the things which he possesseth.' In verses 18, 19, for '*goods*' we should now say 'good things,' the former word meaning simply possessions. In verses 22, 25, 26, for '*thought*,' read 'anxious thought.' In verse 37, '*the lord*' would be better 'their lord,' for clearness. In ver. 49, read 'What will I? would that it were already kindled.'

Begin ch. xiii. 1, 'There came some at that season, telling him . . .' In verses 3 and 5, for '*likewise perish*,' read 'perish in like manner.' In ver. 17, '*When he had said*' should be 'while he

was saying.' In ver. 31, for '*will kill thee*,' read 'is minded to kill thee.' In ver. 33, for '*walk*' substitute 'journey:' and for '*out of*,' for perspicuity, read 'outside of.'

In ch. xiv. 1, '*As he went*' ought to be 'when he had come.' In verses 7, 8, 9, for '*rooms*,' '*room*,' substitute 'places,' 'place;' and for '*and thou begin*,' 'then shalt thou begin.' In ver. 33, '*forsaketh not*' ought to be 'biddeth not farewell to.'

In ch. xv. 7, for '*likewise*' should stand 'in like manner.'

In ch. xvi. 1, for '*had wasted*,' 'was wasting.' Ver. 2, for '*give an account*,' 'give up the account.' In ver. 8 (for perspicuity), for '*the lord*,' 'his lord;' and for '*in their generation*,' 'for their own generation.' Ver. 9, for '*everlasting*,' 'the everlasting.' In ver. 23, '*hell*' is not the final place of torments; but 'Hadés,' the place of departed spirits, the place whither our Lord went, having its blissful and its baleful side. In ver. 25, '*receivedst*' should be 'receivedst in full.' In ver. 26, it should be, 'In order that they which would pass from hence to you may not be able: and that they may not pass to us,' etc.

In ch. xvii. 6, '*sycamine*' ought to be 'mul-

berry.' In ver. 21, for '*within you*' it should be 'among you.' It does not mean that the kingdom of God is within men's hearts, but that it was already begun among the Jews. In ver. 33, '*preserve*' should be 'quicken.'

In ch. xviii. 7, for '*though he bear long with them*,' substitute 'and he is long suffering over them.' In ver. 12, for '*possess*,' 'acquire.' In ver. 16, for '*them*,' 'the infants;' and for '*little children*,' 'the little children,' as in Mark x. 14, where the words are the same. In ver. 42, the word rendered '*hath saved thee*' is the same as that rendered '*hath made thee whole*,' in Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34; Luke xvii. 19.

In ch. xix. 3, for '*press*' should stand 'multitude:' in ver. 15, for '*how much every man had gained by trading*,' 'what business they had carried on;' in ver. 18, for '*gained*,' 'made' (it is not the same word as in ver. 16).

In ch. xx. 20, for '*unto the power and authority*,' 'unto the ruling power, and unto the authority' ('the ruling power' being one thing, and 'the authority of the governor' being another): in ver. 36, '*neither*' should be 'for neither,' and '*the children*' (twice) should be 'sons.' In ver. 37, '*at the*

bush, when' should be 'in the history concerning the bush, how.' In ver. 47, '*shew*' should be 'pretence,' as it stands in Matt. xxiii. 14, Mark xii. 40, where the word is the same.

In ch. xxi. 5, '*gifts*' should be 'offerings:' in ver. 16, '*cause to be*' should be omitted. In ver. 19, '*possess ye*' should be 'ye shall acquire.' In ver. 21, '*countries*' should be 'fields.' In ver. 23, '*in the land*' should be 'on the earth.' The latter part of ver. 24 should stand 'into all the nations: and Jerusalem shall remain trodden down by the nations, until the times of the nations shall be fulfilled.' In ver. 36, for '*shall*,' substitute 'are about to.' In ver. 37, 38, it should stand, 'And during the days . . . . and during the nights . . . . and early in the mornings.'

In ch. xxii. 6, '*in the absence of the multitude*' may be rendered also 'without tumult.' In ver. 31, '*desired*' ought to be 'prevailed:' and in ver. 32, '*art converted*' should be 'hast turned again.' The latter part of ver. 36 should stand, 'and he that hath none (*i.e.*, in purse), let him sell his garment, and buy a sword.' In ver. 42, it should be, 'if thou be willing to remove this cup from me' . . . . the sentence being broken off there. In

ver. 59 (and in ch. xxiii. 2) there is no word in the original corresponding to '*fellow*:' it would be much better 'this man.' In ver. 67, it should be, 'If thou art the Christ, tell us:' and in ver. 69, '*Hereafter*' should be 'Henceforth.'

In ch. xxiii. 4, 48, '*people*' should be 'multitudes:' in ver. 15, '*unto him*,' 'by him:' in ver. 27, '*people*,' 'the people;' in ver. 31, it should be, 'if they do these things to the green tree, what must be done to the dry?' In ver. 32, read 'two others, malefactors:' in ver. 33, for '*Calvary*,' 'a skull:' in ver. 40, 'Dost thou also not . . . . :' in ver. 47, for '*this was a righteous man*,' 'this man was righteous:' in ver. 54, for '*drew on*,' 'was dawning.'

In ch. xxiv. 4, for '*stood by*,' read 'came upon:' in ver. 12, for '*Then arose Peter*,' 'But Peter arose:' and for '*departed, wondering in himself*,' 'went away home, wondering at:' in ver. 17, for '*communications*,' read 'disputes,' and for '*to*,' 'with.' In ver. 18, for '*Art thou only a stranger*,' 'Dost thou sojourn alone:' in ver. 25, for '*fools*,' 'without understanding:' in ver. 26, for '*enter*,' 'have entered:' in ver. 37, for '*had seen*,' 'beheld:' and in ver. 49, for '*endued*,' 'clothed.'

V.

ST. JOHN.

WE have been dealing wholly as yet, in writing of the three former Gospels, with various modifications of the great common cycle of apostolic oral testimony. The three Evangelists wrote this down, and filled it out, as directed by the Divine Spirit, with that peculiar aim, and in that individual style, which belonged to the character and habit of feeling of each. Hence the Three, though varying in amount of historical record and in narration of minute details, differ in the main but little where they are on common ground. Hence, too, in their reports of our Lord's discourses, while again the tendency of each writer may be seen in the kind of sayings which he has preserved, the general complexion of the things said is for the most part the same.

Take the words of our Lord from which you will, and there is a character pervading them which stamps them as faithful records of the teaching of one and the same Person, and at the same time presents to us a consistent and easily-imagined idea of what that person must have been. But now we stand on totally different ground. We have to deal with a writer who is not only a faithful reporter, not only a diligent collector—with a writer whose individuality not only casts a complexion over a history which may in the main be identical with another history. St. John writes on system—writes evidently with purposes in view. With him the impression made is not, so to speak, an accident of the history, left to its course, and to the effect on the reader's mind of that which was said or done; but it is first thought of, and those incidents and those discourses are selected which may best serve its end, and for that end they are related, and not for themselves in any case. Again, in reading St. John's Gospel, we seem to see our Lord on a different side from that on which we have contemplated Him when reading the Three. Nothing can be more consistent, nothing more individual, than the cast of all His dis-

courses as collected by St. John; but, at the same time, nothing at first sight can be more diverse from the complexion of those things which the Three relate Him to have been in the habit of saying.

I merely state these things now; to inquire into and elucidate them will be my main object in this chapter. For to describe aright the nature and the reasons of the difference between St. John's Gospel and the Three, is, in fact, to enter into the object and contents of that Gospel itself.

Let us place ourselves at Ephesus, almost half a century after the ascension of our Lord into heaven. First, let us inquire what manner of place we are in. Ephesus was the capital of Asia, and in Asia, the capital of heathendom. At the time of which we write the great temple of Diana is still standing, and resorted to by all the world. But there is one point even more to our present purpose. At Ephesus, an outpost of Asia towards Europe, met the mysticism of the East and the philosophy of the West. It seems to have been here first that the peculiar Greek terms which are found in the writings of the Platonist Jews of Alexandria, were adopted as the representatives of Christian

truth. The students of their books had already become accustomed, for example, to read of the 'Word of God' as a Person inferior only to God Himself—to see it stated that 'all things were made by Him;' that He was 'the image of God;' that He was 'the first-born Son of the Father,' 'not unbegotten like God, nor begotten like us'—these, and many like expressions, being found in the works of Philo the Jew, who had flourished about twenty years previously.

Let us look again at the state of things at Ephesus, as regards the Christian Church founded there by St. Paul. The great Apostle had told them in his farewell speech at Miletus (Acts xx.), 'that after his departure grievous wolves should enter among them, not sparing the flock, and that of their own selves men should arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.' All this seems to have happened as he had predicted. Bitter dissensions had arisen, obliterating that love which is the greatest of Christian graces. The new philosophy had been employed as the vehicle of grossly erroneous views concerning the person and nature of the Son of God. With some He was not truly man: He had

taken our flesh, and eaten and drunk in His disciples' presence, and suffered pain and death, only in a semblance, for appearance' sake. With others He was not God: an emanation from God had entered into Him at His baptism to fit Him for His ministry; but at His Passion this Divine Spirit forsook Him, and a mere man was crucified.

Beside these errors, tending to uproot all Christianity, based as it is on the union of the Divine and human natures in the Divine person of our Lord, there were others affecting purity of practice and holiness of life. It was held that a man might have part in Christ, and yet not follow Christ's righteous example—might live in Him, and yet be forsaken of God.

And amidst all this breaking up of the faith once delivered, amidst all this peril of the ship which once had Christ on board, and still had His presence by His Spirit,—whose hand was on the helm at Ephesus? What voice spoke to these discordant elements, with power from Him who once commanded the winds and waves to be still?

Many there were at Ephesus who remembered that sad day, when the burning but loving words of

their father in the faith had entered their very hearts at Miletus: the fervour of that last embrace on the beach had never passed from them. But he could speak to them no longer. The mighty heart was cold in its grave at Rome. They might read his glorious Epistle, less written to them specially than to the whole Church through them. But danger was imminent; clouds had gathered about the bright vision which St. Paul had revealed to them; a new revelation seemed to be needful to clear up his teaching; more light from heaven, to show which was sun and which was shade in the mist of error which was creeping over them.

Another writing they had, addressed to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, penned by the eager but chastened hand of him who was thrice commissioned to feed the flock of Christ, full of encouragement, full of solemn prophetic warning; but in this emergency they listened for his living voice in vain. Peter, too, had passed to his glorious rest; girded by others, and carried whither he would not.

Was there no other left to them?—none who might throw across the now familiar course of

Christian instruction a ray of light fresh from heaven?—none who might take up the weapons, bright and beautiful, now wielded by the adversary, and arm with them the soldiers of God?—none who might bring up from the inner places of the Lord's intercourse with His own His most sacred utterances concerning Himself?—none who might show Him forth as having in Himself all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,—as the Light of the world, the Life of men, the Bread of God which came down from heaven, the present Comforter, still revealed by another Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth?

O for a voice to utter more truth about Him who is Truth! O for some great apostle's authority to proclaim His Godhead—for some eye-witness's testimony to bear record of His manhood! O for some man full of the Holy Ghost to tell us what He spake in His conflict with His deadly foes—whether He said aught to them of which we have not heard: to tell us also of His great significant acts, whether aught fell from Him by which our understanding of them may be turned from inference into certainty!

And such an one there was in Ephesus; the

last, and in some sense the greatest, of the apostolic band. It has been well remarked, that everything relating to St. John seems to partake of the sanctity which invests the person and recollections of his Divine Master. He was the disciple whom Jesus loved. He seems to have drunk deeper of the spirit of Jesus than any of the rest. One can hardly think of him apart from his Lord. And our notices of his apostolic course are very few and scanty. At the foot of the cross he took the mother of Jesus into his protection, at the dying command of her Son—'unto his own home,' wherever that might be. For many years it appears to have been at Jerusalem. After the martyrdom of Stephen, we are told (Acts viii. 1) that all the disciples were dispersed away from Jerusalem, *except the apostles.* In Acts xii. 1, and following verses, it would appear that the apostolic body were still there, Herod having killed one of the chief of them, and having prepared to take another. In ch. xv., a visit of Paul and Barnabas is related, which is demonstrably identical with that related in Gal. ii. At that visit St. Paul saw 'James, Cephas, and John.' He does not say how many other of the apostles.

This was, in all probability, in A.D. 50, twenty years after the ascension of our Lord. After this we lose sight of St. John, till we find him at Ephesus, ruling the Church there. It must have been some years after the death of St. Paul that he came to Ephesus. It is not impossible that it may have been during, and perhaps as a consequence of, the tumults in Jerusalem which preceded the last dread siege.

From that time he ruled the Church, and taught in the chief city of Asia. Before he came, the course of oral apostolic instruction had been well made known there. Whether any of our three Gospels had reached the Ephesian Christians, we cannot say, but we may be pretty certain that the general history of our Lord's life and ministry was familiar to them.

Probably the design of writing a doctrinal Gospel was suggested to the beloved Apostle on his finding how matters stood at Ephesus. We may suppose him there becoming daily more and more acquainted with the peculiar terms of that philosophy by whose spurious reasonings the Church was becoming deceived; and daily taught by the informing Spirit how to apply its words and its

thoughts to the high purpose of setting forth God's truth respecting His Son.

At length the beloved disciple bore his testimony. It was, as has been already observed, of a totally different kind from those already borne by the Evangelists. It bore upon its surface, not facts to be received, but doctrines to be believed. It opened, not with a human generation, not with a careful and formal preface, not with an announcement of the fulfilment of prophecy, but with a superhuman revelation of that which was before time began. 'In the beginning' seems to resume the book of Genesis: but it reaches back even beyond that primitive record, even to the pre-existence of the Son of God before all created things. And at once, without introduction or apology, the Apostle grasps the adversary's weapons and makes them his own. The *Word* of God, as we said, had been much spoken of by Philo and the Jewish Platonists: He was as yet the offspring of the human imagination: He was now to be first heard of as affirmed by Divine Truth. Whom they ignorantly worshipped, the Evangelist now declared unto them. There has been no sublimer sentence in human speech than this, 'In the beginning was

the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' And from every verse, as we proceed, we learn what none had ever told us before. St. Paul had indeed paved the way for these lofty truths to be recognised: the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had echoed, and indeed carried further, St. Paul's doctrinal declarations: but never had the doctrine of the Divine and human natures in Christ been so simply and so profoundly set forth as in the wonderful opening of this Gospel. In it we learn the eternal preexistence of the Word with God, and as God: the creation of all things without exception by His means: He was the source of life, and His life is the light of men. He came into the world, and the world knew Him not: He came to His own possessions, and His own people rejected Him. But all did not so: and to them who received Him, He gave the right to become children of God, not in a carnal, but in a spiritual sense. And, moreover, this Word became flesh, and had His tabernacle among us—a tabernacle like that ancient one, not without the glory of the Lord shining in it and from it. And this glory the writer and his brethren beheld—such glory as

befitted the only-begotten of the Father, one full of grace and truth. And no wonder, for the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came into the world by this Word become flesh, even Jesus Christ.

What truths are here! This is not the fervid argument of St. Paul, not the affectionate exhortation of St. Peter, not the divine morality of St. James, not the flashing and kindling invective of St. Jude, but something higher and deeper even than them all; the very ground—tones of the heavenly harmonies, in which each of those others bore a part.

Let me attempt to carry on the reader through the plan of this wonderful Gospel,—for the whole of it is formed on a fixed and set plan; not an incident nor a saying but serves its purpose, and contributes to the matter in hand. I may premise that the whole Gospel is like a great drama, wherein several underplots are pursued in conjunction with that of main interest. It is possible to take any one of these and follow it out, and to regard the others as for the time subordinate to it. And the consequence has been, that many plans of the Gospel have been drawn out, differing from

one another—each full of deep interest and answering to its contents. At the same time, there can be no doubt that all these are subordinate to the Apostle's main design, and that he who keeps that main design most steadily in view, and regulates his divisions of the Gospel accordingly, will be nearest the truth as to its real arrangement. The main subject may be given in very few words: 'The glory of Christ as manifested by His public working in the world; which public working led to His death; which death further manifested His glory.' Let us follow this ground-note through the Gospel.

First, the glory of Christ is set forth, as we have seen, in the preface (ch. i. 1-18). That being done, we have the Son of God, the Word made flesh, introduced into the world (ch. i. 19—ii. 11); first, by the testimony of the Baptist, who testifies to His priority in time and in dignity to himself, who was but a voice proclaiming His advent; and testifies also to having seen the Spirit descend and abide upon Him; and by pointing Him out as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world, self-denyingly parts with his own disciples, whom that proclamation caused to follow

Him (ch. i. 19-40). Thus Jesus being introduced into His work in the world, next bears witness of Himself (i. 40—ii. 11). He draws disciples to Him, and testifies to them of His dignity and power. He bestows on Simon the prophetic name of Peter, the rock (i. 42): He commands Philip to follow Him (i. 43): He declares to Nathanael His knowledge of him, and announces the great series of glories which are to come (i. 47-51); and He manifests forth His glory to His disciples by His first great creative miracle at Cana in Galilee,—His glory, causing them still further to believe on Him, both by the power which they saw exerted, by the kind of result produced, and the beneficence which prompted the exertion.

Then we advance to His first manifestation of Himself as the Son of God (ii. 12—iv. 54). This is begun in Jerusalem and Judæa, by His driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple—'Make not *my Father's* house a house of merchandise' (ii. 12-22); by His knowledge, which needed not that any should testify of man (ii. 25); by His great discourse with the Jewish teacher Nicodemus, concerning the heavenly new birth by the

Spirit; the lifting up of the Son of Man; the sending by God of His Son into the world that the believer on Him might not perish but have eternal life, whereas the unbeliever abides under condemnation because he rejects the only-begotten Son of God (iii. 1-21). And here is introduced the crowning and decisive testimony of the Baptist, setting forth Jesus as the bridegroom of His Church—as the Son of God into whose hands all things are given by the Father, and in faith in whom stands everlasting life.

And then the testimony of Jesus to himself goes on in Samaria and in Galilee (iv. 1-54). In Samaria, by the wonderful discourse with the woman at the well, where He, the weary and thirsty traveller, proclaims Himself as the only fountain of never-failing water of life; penetrates, by His all-knowledge, the woman's life and conscience, and announces to her the spiritual worship of the Father; departing, with the seeds of faith in Himself as the Saviour of the world, sown in that city of Samaria (see Acts viii. 5-8).

Nor must Galilee be left without His own testimony of Himself. By another of those wonderful proofs of power which St. John characteristically

always calls 'signs,' Jesus implants faith in the heart of the nobleman at Capernaum.

And now opens the second great portion of the Gospel, extending from ch. v. 1, to xii. 50, and comprehending *The Conflict between Jesus and the Jews.* Wonderful indeed is the way in which this is carried onward by the Evangelist. Jesus is set forth in it, after his manner, as the light and life of men: these His attributes are shown by manifold signs and discourses; in each capacity He offers himself to the Jews; in each capacity He is rejected by them.

But to come to the details of this portion. In ch. v. we have the miracle from which the conflict takes its open beginning. Jesus shows himself as the bestower of life, both by the miracle itself, and, which this Evangelist is always careful to record, by our Lord's comment on it, for the sake of which frequently the miracle itself is given. (See especially verses 21-29, 39, 40.) They resist Him as the author and giver of life: they attempt to stop His working, which was God's working, because He had committed a formal violation of the ordinances of the law by breaking the Sabbath.

The same subject is continued through ch. vi.

Here we have Jesus as the physical life of men, and further as the spiritual life. By His great miracle of feeding the five thousand, He shows how all look to Him for their sustenance; but this was, though great, the least part of the miracle. The wondrous '*sign*' itself was but a faint shadow of the far more glorious truth that He is the Bread of Life which came down from God to sustain man's best life; that by His body broken, and His blood shed, men were to be nourished unto eternal life.

But around this His self-manifestation, as before round that other, rages the conflict: some vainly misapprehending Him; others finding it 'an hard saying,' and going away and walking with Him no longer; while, on the other hand, faith is ever called out more and more; and His own, led by the forward and plain-speaking Peter, declare their adherence to Him as having the words of eternal LIFE, and as being themselves persuaded that He is the Holy One of God.

Jesus, then, is the Life of men. But He is also the LIGHT of the world. And the manifestation of Him as such, is the subject of chapters vii.–x. In the first of these, He goes up to the feast at

Jerusalem (notice how the Apostle is ever introducing Him between unbelief on the one hand, and belief on the other. As His disciples believed in and confessed Him, so His brethren disbelieve and misunderstand Him). At the feast, the Jews are divided in opinion about Him. Gradually the conflict approaches its height. They are with difficulty restrained from laying hold on Him. He defeats, by the majesty of His presence and discourse, the officers sent by the Pharisees to take Him (ver. 45, 46). He testifies openly to Himself as the light of the world (ch. viii. 12): again the conflict opens, and attains the utmost height in the latter half of the chapter, amidst the glorious things which He says of Himself, and the assertion of His own eternal pre-existence. These sayings His adversaries ascribe to possession by Satan, and finally take up stones to cast at Him as the punishment of blasphemy.

In ch. ix. the same aspect of the divine character in Jesus is presented, but on an occasion very different. Here He reveals Himself as the Light of the World (ver. 5) by a notable miracle of beneficence and power. He creates sight in one born blind. Again He chooses the Sabbath-day,

on which to assert His working for the good of men and God's glory. Again, this revelation of Himself as the world's light, brings judgment on those who hate the light, together with faith and blessing to those who love and walk in it (ver. 35-41).

In ch. x. the subject is again followed out in another of its bearings. The blind had been leading the blind. The Pharisees had been false shepherds, feeding themselves and not the flock. He who was come to be the Light of the World is the true, the Good Shepherd, whose own the sheep are. Now begins the first mention of His laying down His life for the sheep; now He begins to hint also that He was about to take it again. Now comes in also the mention of the great primal covenant between Him and His Father of the gift of eternal life, which He, the world's light and life, would bestow upon His own sheep: of the absolute unity between Himself and His Father. Again the enmity reaches its height, and they take up stones to cast at Him; and again He withdraws Himself from their land, retiring beyond Jordan to the place where John at first baptized. And notice how nothing in this

Gospel is introduced without deep reason, belonging to the main design of the Evangelist. Why this mention of the place of our Lord's retreat? Not to show historical accuracy: not for the mere information of the readers: but because it is connected with the testimony of John, and with the effects of that testimony and its verification by fact, in causing many to believe on Him there.

And now opens the third section of this second great portion of the Gospel, containing chapters xi.-xii. It may be thus entitled: *The delivery of Jesus to death is the life, and at the same time the judgment of the world.* It begins with the recital of that greatest of the Lord's miracles, which brought the enmity of the Jews to its head, and prepared the way for His death. The sickness of Lazarus was not to end with death, but was for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby. And notice that this word, '*glorified*,' is throughout this section used of the Death of Christ, through which He went to glory. Notice, too, how, in all these narratives, the workings of faith and of unbelief are wonderfully interwoven, and set before us together. Notice here the faith, and half-faith, and unbelief of Mary, of

Martha, of Thomas, of the Jews; see the perfect humanity of our Lord in his self-chiding and tears over the grave of Lazarus; see also the divinity of Him who could with a word do what was here done. The sublimest moment in written history is that in which Jesus stood by the tomb of the four-days' dead, and having wept and prayed, shouted (for such is the word) with a loud cry, 'Lazarus, come forth.'

And now the preparation is made, which is to lead to the sacrifice of one man for the people. The Jews' counsel is taken, and henceforth they seek to put Jesus to death. He withdraws to Ephraim with His disciples, and there are questionings at Jerusalem whether He will come up to the feast.

The next chapter opens with prophetic intimations of the event soon about to happen. The anticipatory preparation for His burial; the triumphant entry into Jerusalem, and meantime the thickening of the plots against Him; the endeavours of the Greeks to see Jesus, and His discourse thereon, setting forth that His death should draw all men unto Him: with these St. John's narrative, or rather doctrinal version, of the Lord's ministry

and conflict with the Jews, comes to an end. And then follow two weighty sections at the end of ch. xii.; the first, a comment by the Evangelist on the unbelief and hardness of the Jews; the other, a summary of sayings of our Lord respecting those that should receive Him, and those that should reject Him.

Having now arrived at that portion of the Gospel which treats of the Passion, and, as before, reserving that for a special comparison of the four Gospels in this particular, I pass to the corrections necessary in our English version of this Gospel, whether from our translators having been ignorant of the text contained in the most ancient MSS., or from their having given an inadequate rendering of that which was before them.

In ch. i. 16, instead of '*And* of his fulness,' ought to be read, 'For of his fulness.' In ver. 18 there is a remarkable variation in some of our principal ancient MSS., which, instead of 'only-begotten Son,' read 'only-begotten God.' It is impossible to say which was the original. On weighing the whole of the evidence, which I have stated in the notes to my Greek Testament, I have concluded that 'only-begotten Son' is the more

probable reading, and have therefore retained it. Ver. 24 ought to stand, 'Now they had been sent by the Pharisees.' There ought to be a semicolon at the end of ver. 26, and ver. 27 should begin 'He that cometh after me, whose,' etc. In ver. 28, '*Bethabara*' ought to be 'Bethany:' not, of course, the village near Jerusalem, but another place of that name: so it stands in all the most ancient MSS. In ver. 41, before 'Christ' omit '*the*.' In the last verse, 'Hereafter' is omitted by our two oldest MSS. (See our second list, p. 142.)

In ch. ii. 17, '*hath eaten*' ought to be 'shall eat;' and in ver. 22, '*unto them*' should be omitted.

In ch. iii. 2, '*Jesus*' ought to be 'him.' In ver. 15, our two oldest MSS. omit the words 'not perish, but.' In ver. 25, instead of '*the Jews*,' read 'a Jew,' with most of our oldest MSS.

In ch. iv. 42, omit '*the Christ*.'

In ch. v. the passage from the word '*waiting*' in ver. 3 to the end of ver. 4 is omitted by our four greatest ancient MSS., the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Cambridge, and the Paris MSS.; while in those which do contain it there are several variations, which is an almost certain sign of spurious-

ness. The words are to be rejected. In ver. 16, 'and sought to slay him' should be omitted. In ver. 30, for '*the Father which hath sent me*,' read 'him that sent me.'

In ch. vi. 11, omit the words '*to the disciples, and the disciples*,' leaving the sentence 'he distributed to them that were set down.' In ver. 22, instead of '*save that one whereinto his disciples were entered*,' read 'save one.' In ver. 39, for '*the Father's will which hath sent me*,' read, as in the last verse, 'the will of him that sent me.' In ver. 40, for '*And this is the will of Him that sent me*,' read 'For this is the will of my Father.' In ver. 45 omit '*therefore*.' In ver. 51 the words, 'which I will give,' are omitted by almost all the ancient authorities. If they are omitted, they must be supplied in the sense, so that the difference is not important to the meaning. In ver. 55, 'meat *indeed*,' and 'drink *indeed*,' should be 'true meat,' and 'true drink. In ver. 58 omit the word '*manna*.' In ver. 63, for '*speak*,' read 'have spoken.' In ver. 65, for '*my* Father,' read 'the Father.' In ver. 69, instead of '*that Christ, the Son of the living God*,' read, with all our most ancient MSS., 'the Holy One of God.'

In chap. vii. 8, omit '*yet.*' In ver. 26, for '*this is the very Christ,*' read 'this man is the Christ.' In ver. 40, for '*many,*' read 'some;' and for '*this saying,*' 'these sayings.' In ver. 50, for '*he that came to Jesus by night,*' it should be, 'he that came to him before.' It is to be noticed that our most ancient MS., the Sinaitic, omits the clause altogether; and it perhaps has been inserted as a description of Nicodemus.

We now come to a very well known and important subject of critical variation, though hardly of doubt to any one who has the least intelligent acquaintance with the question. I mean the passage respecting the woman taken in adultery, including also ch. vii. 53. *All* the most ancient MSS. omit it: so do the ancient Syriac version and all the early Fathers. The Cambridge MS. alone, of our principal ones, contains it, and that in a form widely differing from that in our text. In the other MSS. which contain it, there are very considerable variations, both in its wording, and in its *place,* some putting it at the end of this Gospel, others at the end of Luke xxi. These reasons alone would be amply sufficient to exclude it here. But there are more. Its style, in the

original, is entirely distinct from that of St. John. Places and persons are mentioned in it which St. John never mentions. In my own view (which is supported by the best modern writers on St. John), its insertion here entirely breaks the context, and is foreign to the manifest design of the Gospel. In all carefully-edited texts it ought to be omitted. But then comes an important question, 'What are we to think of it? Is it to be treated as Scripture?' It is impossible to give a decisive answer to the question. The Cambridge MS. is notorious for its many apocryphal additions to the primitive text, and this may be one of them. But, on the other hand, the passage contains nothing which should, on its own account, prevent its being an authentic history of an incident in our Lord's ministry. I have ever thought the safest way is to regard it, like the passage at the end of St. Mark, as a portion of the apostolic teaching of which we know not the author; and, though excluding it from the Gospel of St. John, I have never scrupled to regard it as Scripture, and to preach from it. It seems to belong to the last portion of our Lord's ministry, when He spent the nights on the Mount of Olives: and thus the end of Luke xxi. would

be its fittest place. At all events, we must not be moved from an honest determination to stand conscientiously by our evidence, as in God's sight, by any repetition of what Augustine in the fifth century alleged, that certain persons expunged this passage in their MSS. from fear that it might encourage sin. For, on the one hand, this fails entirely to account for the very general omission of it; and on the other, if so, why should ch. vii. 53, be included in the omitted portion?

In ch. viii. 29, for '*the Father hath not left me alone*,' read, 'He left me not alone.' Ver. 38 ought to stand, 'I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye do the things which ye heard from your father.' In ver. 59, the words, '*going through the midst of them, and so passed by*,' should be omitted.

In ch. ix. 8, instead of '*seen him that he was blind*,' read, 'seen him that was a beggar.' In ver. 9, read, 'Others said, Nay, but he is like him.' In ver. 11 omit the words, '*the pool of*.'

In ch. x. 4, for '*his own sheep*,' most of our oldest MSS. have 'all his own.' In ver. 26, 'as I said unto you' is omitted in many ancient MSS.

In ver. 38, for '*Know and believe*,' read 'perceive and know.'

In ch. xi. 41, omit the words, '*from the place where the dead was laid.*'

In ch. xii. 7, read 'Let her alone, that she may keep it until the day of my burying.' In ver. 47, for '*believe not*,' read 'keep them not.'

At the end of ch. xiii. 24, the text is in some confusion. Most of the ancient MSS. have, instead of '*that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake*,' 'and saith unto him, Say who it is of whom he speaketh?'

In ch. xiv. 2, read 'I would have told you: because I go to prepare a place for you.' In ver. 4, read 'whither I go, ye know the way.' In ver. 28, for 'because *I said*, I go unto the Father,' read 'because I go unto the Father.'

In ch. xvi. 3, omit '*unto you.*' In ver. 4, for '*when the time shall come*,' read 'when the time is come.' In ver. 16, omit '*because I go to the Father.*' In ver. 23, read 'If ye shall ask the Father any thing, he will give it you in my name.' In ver. 33, for 'ye *shall have* tribulation,' read 'ye have tribulation.'

In ch. xvii. 11, read 'keep them in thy name

which thou hast given me;' 'which' having for its antecedent, not '*them*,' but '*thy name*.' In ver. 12, omit '*in the world*.' For '*I kept them in thy name*,' many ancient authorities read, 'I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me, and guarded them.' In ver. 17, for '*through thy truth*,' read 'in the truth.' In ver. 21, the second '*one*' is omitted by about half our most ancient authorities.

In ch. xviii. 20, for '*the Jews always*,' read 'all the Jews.'

In ch. xix. 3, for '*and said*,' read 'and they approached him, and said.' In ver. 16, omit 'and led him away.'.

In ch. xx. 16, read 'and saith unto him in Hebrew, Rabboni.' In ver. 29, omit 'Thomas.'

In ch. xxi. 3, omit 'immediately.' In verses 15, 16, 17, most of our ancient MSS. have, instead of '*Jonas*,' 'John.' The '*Amen*' at the end is omitted by nearly all our oldest MSS.

The following are the principal corrections needed in the English version of this Gospel, owing to inadequate renderings of the original.

In ch. i. 3, '*that was made*' should be 'that hath been made.' In ver. 5, for '*in darkness*,'

read 'in the darkness.' In ver. 7, instead of '*for a witness*,' read 'for witness,' or 'for testimony.' In ver. 8, for '*that Light*,' 'the Light' (twice). Verse 9 ought to stand, 'The true Light, which lighteth every man, came into the world.' In ver. 11, the first 'His own,' in the original, is neuter, the second *masculine*. It is difficult to express this in English: it might stand, 'He came to His own possessions, and His own people received Him not.' As it stands in our version, the distinction is lost. In ver. 12, for '*the sons*,' read 'children.' In ver. 14, for '*was made*,' 'became:' there is no sense of being *made*, in the original word. For '*the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father*,' read 'glory as of the only-begotten from the Father.' In ver. 15, it should be, 'John beareth witness of Him, and crieth' (or 'hath cried'); and in the same verse, and in ver. 30, '*is preferred*' ought to be 'taketh place,'[1]—and '*for*' should be 'because.' Verse 16 should begin, 'For out of His fulness all we received:'

[1] We have a curious instance how an ambiguous rendering like '*preferred*' may mislead. The word here means 'has come to be,'—'takes his place or rank,' before me. But Dr. Johnson, in his Dictionary, wishing to exemplify 'prefer' in the sense of '*to love more than another*,' adduces this place,—'He that cometh after me is preferred before me,' as an example of that sense!

and ver. 18 should end, 'he declared Him.' In ver. 19, '*record*' should be 'testimony,' or 'witness.' So also in ver. 32. In ver. 21, '*that Prophet*' should be 'the Prophet.' In ver. 31, for '*I am come*,' read 'came I.' In ver. 32, for '*saw*' read 'have seen,' and the same in ver. 34; where, for '*bare record*,' read 'have borne witness. In ver. 42, for '*And when Jesus beheld him, He said*,' read 'But Jesus looked on him and said:' and for '*A stone*,' which is a mistranslation, read 'Peter.' In ver. 43, for '*would*,' read 'was minded to.' In ver. 45, for '*Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph*,' 'Jesus the son of Joseph, which is from Nazareth.' In ver. 51, instead of '*Hereafter*,' read 'Henceforth;' but several of our oldest authorities omit the word altogether.

In ch. ii. 2, for '*both Jesus was called*,' read 'Jesus also was bidden.' In ver. 3, for '*when they wanted wine*,' read 'when the wine failed.' In ver. 9, for '*the water that was made wine*,' read 'the water now become wine.' In ver. 10, read 'Every man setteth on the good wine first;' and for '*well*,' read 'freely.' In ver. 15, read 'He drove all out of the temple, both the sheep

and the oxen;' and in ver. 16, for '*doves*,' read 'the doves.' In ver. 17, for '*hath eaten*,' substitute 'shall eat.' In ver. 20, for '*rear it up*,' read 'raise it.' In ver. 24, for '*commit*,' read 'trust:' and at the end of ver. 25, 'for of Himself He knew what was in man.'

Ch. iii. should begin, 'But there was a man,' etc. It is connected with what went before; Nicodemus forming an exception to those to whom Jesus did not trust Himself.

In verses 3 and 7, the expression 'born *again*' does not give the sense of the original. It should be 'born anew,' or, 'born from above,' but better the former, as it is evident from Nicodemus's answer, that he understood it of a *new* birth, not of a heavenly one. In ver. 10, '*a master*' ought to be 'the teacher;' and '*knowest*,' 'understandest.' In ver. 17, for '*condemn*,' read 'judge;' in ver. 18, for '*is not condemned*,' 'cometh not into judgment,' and for '*condemned*' 'judged:' and in ver. 19, for '*condemnation*,' 'judgment.' In the same verse, '*light*' and '*darkness*,' each time, should be 'the light,' and 'the darkness;' and in ver. 21, '*truth*' should be 'the truth.'

Ch. iv. 14, should stand, 'but whosoever shall have drunk of the water that I shall give him shall thirst no more for ever; but the water that I shall give him shall become,' etc. Ver. 22 should stand, 'Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know; because salvation cometh of the Jews.' The last clause in ver. 23 should stand, 'for such the Father also seeketh them that worship Him to be.' In ver. 27, for '*talked with the woman*,' read 'was talking with a woman.' In ver. 29, for '*is not this the Christ?*' read 'is this the Christ?' In ver. 37, for '*herein is that saying true*,' read 'herein is fulfilled that true saying.' In ver. 42, the Samaritans' speech should begin, 'No longer do we believe because of thy story.' In ver. 43, for '*two days*,' read 'the two days.' In ver. 51, for '*son*,' 'child.' Ver. 54 ought to begin, 'This again, a second miracle, did Jesus,' etc.

In ch. v. 2, there is no word in the original corresponding to '*market*.' The more probable word to be supplied is 'gate' (see Neh. iii. 1, xii. 39). In ver. 13, for '*had conveyed himself away*,' read 'passed away from him.' In ver. 18, '*his*' ought to be 'his own.' In ver. 19, and in

ch. vi. 11, '*likewise*' should be 'in like manner.' In ver. 21, '*the Son*' should be 'the Son also.' In ver. 24, '*believeth on him*' should be 'believeth him;' *i.e.*, gives credit to his testimony. In the same verse, for '*shall not come into condemnation*,' read 'cometh not into judgment;' and in ver. 29, for '*damnation*' read 'judgment.' Vers. 33-35 should stand, 'Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto me. Yet I receive not my testimony from man; but these things I say, that ye might be saved. He was the lamp, lighted and shining; and ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light. But the testimony which I have is greater than John.' In ver. 39, '*search*' might also be rendered 'ye search.' Ver. 40 should begin, 'And yet ye are not willing' (it is the same verb as that rendered '*ye desire*,' Gal. iv. 9) 'to come to me.' In vers. 41, 44, '*honour*' should be 'glory;' and in the latter verse, '*from God only*,' should be 'from the only God.' In ver. 45, '*trust*' ought to be 'hope;' and in ver. 46, '*have believed*' should be 'believe.'

In ch. vi. 3, 4, for '*a* mountain,' '*a* feast,' read 'the mountain,' 'the feast.' In ver. 6, for '*would do*,' read 'was about to do.' In ver. 10, '*men*,'

the first time, ought to be 'people;' the second time, 'men' is the right word, as distinguished from women and children. In ver. 14, '*that* prophet' should be 'the prophet;' and in ver. 15, '*a* mountain,' 'the mountain.' In vers. 17, 21, for '*went*,' read 'were going;' and begin the latter verse, 'They were willing therefore to receive him,' etc. In ver. 27, instead of '*labour not for*,' read 'work not for,' to correspond to 'work' in vers. 28, 29, where the word is the same in the original. In the end of the same verse, it should be, 'for him the Father sealed, even God.' In ver. 31, for '*manna in the desert*,' read 'the manna' (so also in ver. 49) 'in the wilderness.' In ver. 32, for '*that bread*,' 'the bread.' In ver. 37, '*all that the Father hath given me*,' does not convey the sense of the original, in which the 'all that' is in the neuter gender. It would perhaps best be expressed by 'all that which the Father giveth me.' In the next verse, for '*came*,' read 'am come;' and so in ver. 42 also. In ver. 45, read 'Every man that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned. . . .' And in the next verse, for '*of God*,' read 'from God.' In ver. 49, for '*are dead*,' read 'they died.' In ver. 57, instead

of '*by the Father*,' and '*by me*,' read 'because of the Father,' and 'because of me.' Ver. 58 should stand, 'This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat and died: he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.' Ver. 61, for '*when Jesus knew*,' which conveys the wrong idea, that at some definite moment He acquired the knowledge, read 'but Jesus knowing.' Ver. 62 should stand, 'What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending?' etc. In ver. 63, for '*quickeneth*,' read 'giveth life:' for '*speak*,' 'have spoken:' and omit '*they*' both times. In ver. 66, instead of '*From* that time,' read 'Upon this.' The expression does not point so much at the *time* of their departure, as at its occasion. Ver. 69, for '*believe, and are sure*,' read 'have believed and know.'

In ch. vii. 1, '*Jewry*' should be 'Judea,' as usual. In ver. 4, '*shew*' should be 'manifest,' as in ch. i. 31; ii. 11; iii. 21; ix. 3; xvii. 6, etc., where the word is the same. In ver. 5, for '*neither did his brethren*,' render, 'even his brethren did not.' In ver. 12, for '*people*' (both times), read 'multitude.' This inaccuracy often occurs—*e.g.*, vers. 20, 40, 43, 49—and should not have

been committed; the word expressing '*people*' is a different one, and always means God's people, the Jews—*e.g.*, in Luke ii. 10, 'to all the people,' which is often misunderstood. In ver. 14, for '*Now about*,' read 'But when it was now.' In ver. 17, for '*will do*,' read 'be willing to do;' and for '*of* myself' (so in next verse, '*of* himself'), 'from myself'—*i.e.*, from mine own resources or strength. In ver. 19, '*go ye about*' should be 'seek ye;' and in ver. 20, '*goeth about*' should be 'seeketh.' In ver. 21, '*have done*' should be 'did;' and in ver. 22, '*gave*' should be 'hath given.' In ver. 26, it should be, 'Have the rulers come to know that this man is the Christ?' In ver. 27, 'when the Christ cometh.' In ver. 28, 'Therefore cried Jesus, teaching in the temple, and saying.' In ver. 29, 'because I am from him, and He sent me.' In ver. 30, 'Therefore sought they.' In ver. 31, 'But many of the multitude. . . .' and 'when the Christ shall come.' In ver. 32, 'heard the multitude murmuring these things.' In ver. 35, 'The Jews therefore said;' and 'whither will this man go;' and for '*Gentiles*' (both times), 'Greeks.' In ver. 37, for '*that great day*,' read 'which was the great day.' In ver. 39,

for '*should receive*,' read 'were about to receive:' omit the word '*given*,' which is not expressed at all in the original, and read 'because neither was Jesus glorified.' In ver. 41, 'Doth the Christ then come?' In ver. 44, for '*would have taken him*,' 'were minded to take him.' In ver. 49, '*people*' should be 'multitude,' and the word is here spoken in contempt, meaning 'rabble,' or 'canaille.' In ver. 51, '*before it hear him*,' should be 'except it first hear from him.' In ver. 52, 'Search, and see that out of Galilee hath arisen no prophet.'

Omitting the passage, ch. vii. 53—viii. 11,—in ch. viii. 12, '*darkness*' should be 'the darkness:' and in verses 13, 14, '*record*' should be 'witness' throughout. In ver. 21, for '*my way*,' read 'away.' In ver. 25, instead of '*Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning*,' which is a wrong rendering of the original, read 'In very deed that same which I speak unto you.' In ver. 29, for '*the Father hath not left me alone*,' read 'he left me not alone.' In verses 34, 35, the word '*servant*' hardly expresses the sense; it should be 'bondman.' In ver. 37, for '*hath no place*,' read 'gaineth no ground.' In ver. 42, read 'and am come from

God; for neither have I come of myself,' etc. In ver. 44, '*ye will do*,' is a most inadequate rendering. It gives the idea of a mere future, whereas the original is, 'ye like to do,' 'it is your desire to do.' In the same verse, '*abode*' is a mistake, the verb being *present* in tense: read 'standeth not in the truth.' At the end of the same verse, 'thereof' would give the sense better than '*of it*,' meaning *of lying*. In ver. 46, '*convinceth*' should be 'convicteth:' see on ch. xvi. 8. In ver. 47, it would be better, 'for this cause ye hear them not.' In verses 51, 52, 55, for '*saying*,' read 'word.' In ver. 53, for '*are* dead' (twice), read 'died.' Ver. 54, for '*honour*,' '*honour*,' '*honoureth*,' read 'glorify,' 'glory,' 'glorifieth.' In ver. 58, '*was*' should be 'was made.' It is the same verb as that rendered 'were made,' and 'hath been made,' in ch. i. 3: whereas in 'I am,' the verb is that rendered 'was' in chap. i. 1.

In ch. ix. 2, for '*was*,' read 'should be.' Ver. 3, for '*neither hath this man sinned*,' which may be wrongly understood, read 'neither did this man sin.' In ver. 5, '*as long as*' should be 'when.' In ver. 8, for '*sat and begged*,' read 'sitteth and beggeth.' In ver. 17, for '*that*,' read 'seeing

that.' Ver. 24 should begin, 'So they called the second time . . .;' and '*give God the praise,*' ought to be 'give glory to God:' it does not mean that he was to ascribe to God the merit of his healing, but is a formula of adjuring him to tell the truth: see Joshua vii. 19; as much as to say, 'Remember you are in God's presence, and speak as unto Him.' In ver. 25, read 'I know that though a blind man, I now see.' It is not that I *was* blind and now *see,* but that I, who am known by all as a blind man, now see. Ver. 29, '*spake*' should be 'hath spoken:' and '*as for this fellow*' should be 'but as for this man.' The contemptuous appellation does not exist in the original. Ver. 32, for '*was it not heard,*' read 'it was never heard:' and for '*any man*' (which might seem as if a distinction were made between human and divine agency), 'any one.' Ver. 35, read 'and he found him, and said unto him.' In ver. 41, for '*should have no sin,*' read 'would not have sin.'

In ch. x. 6, '*parable*' is hardly the word, nor is the Greek term that commonly so rendered. 'Allegory' is nearer the mark. In ver. 10, '*am come*' should be 'came.' In ver. 11, '*giveth*'

ought to be 'layeth down,' as in verses 15, 17, 18. It is the same word. In ver. 12, '*catcheth*' should be 'teareth.' The former part of ver. 15 is a mistranslation. There ought to be only a comma at the end of ver. 14, and the sense should proceed, 'Even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father'—*i.e.*, the knowledge which the Lord Jesus has of His people, and they of Him, is compared with that which the Father has of Him, and He of the Father. As the words stand in our version, they are without relevance in the context. In ver. 16 read, 'and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.' The rendering '*fold*' instead of 'flock' here is a grievous and important error. *Fold* has all through the passage been expressed by one Greek word, *aulé;* but here it is not that word, but another, *poimné*, which in every other place where it occurs is rendered 'flock' (Matthew xxvi. 31; Luke ii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 7). It is impossible to acquit King James's translators of some unfairness here. Tyndale's version, which they had before them, had the faithful rendering as far as this word is concerned; but they followed the erroneous one. For it is not true, that there is to be in the Christian Church *one fold:* one flock

there is, but it is contained in many folds. In ver. 18, as before in ch. ix. 32, ambiguity would be prevented by rendering, instead of 'no *man*,' 'no one.' Ver. 26, read 'Nevertheless ye believe not, for ye are not,' etc. Ver. 28, for '*neither shall any man*,' read 'And none shall;' and in the next verse, 'None is able to pluck out of my Father's hand;'—*i.e.*, 'that which He holdeth fast none can tear away;' '*them*' is not expressed. Ver. 31 should begin, 'The Jews therefore.' I may mention once for all, that our translators have very often lost the connecting thread of St. John's style, by rendering 'therefore' as if it were merely the temporal adverb 'then.' This Evangelist connects every step of the advancing hatred of the Jews, and of the expanding glory of the Only-begotten from the Father, by this particle 'therefore.' One step in each leads on to the next. I have not been able to specify a tenth part of the occurrences of this mistake, but notice it only where most important, as here: the Jews taking up stones having been occasioned by their hearing of the blasphemy which they attributed to our Lord. In verse 35, '*broken*' should be 'made void.' In ver. 39, for '*but he escaped*,' read 'and he passed.'

In ch. xi. 8, for '*of late sought*,' read 'were but now seeking.' In ver. 10, for '*there is no light*,' read 'the light is not.' In ver. 11, for '*sleepeth*,' read 'is fallen asleep;' and in the next verse, 'Lord, if he is fallen asleep, he will recover.' In ver. 22, read 'Nevertheless even now I know that,' etc. In ver. 25, for '*were dead*,' read 'have died.' At the end of ver. 26, 'shall never die,' might also be rendered 'shall not die for evermore.' In ver. 31, for '*comforted*,' read 'were comforting,'—*i.e.*, trying to comfort. In ver. 33, for '*groaned in the spirit and was troubled*,' read 'was greatly moved in spirit, and troubled himself.' For the present, as Bengel expresses it, our Lord 'austerely repressed His tears,' putting a check on himself; afterwards they burst forth. Verse 36 is another instance of the beauty of the original being marred by '*then*' being put where it should have been 'therefore.' 'The Jews therefore,'—because Jesus thus wept—'said, Behold how he loved him!' Ver. 37, '*And*' should be 'But;' these persons forming an exception to the foregoing. 'The blind' looks as if it were plural, and as if many instances were referred to; but it is singular, referring only to the case in ch. ix. Render therefore 'the blind

man.' 'That even' gives a wrong sense: Lazarus was not more nor less hard to keep from dying than other men; what the original has is, 'have caused also that this man should not have died?' In ver. 38, again, for '*groaning in himself*,' render 'greatly moved within himself' (see on ver. 33). In ver. 41, for '*Then*,' read 'So.' In ver. 42, '*And*' should be 'Yet;' and '*because of the people*,' 'for the sake of the multitude.' In ver. 43, '*cried*' is not strong enough. It is an unusual word. The Lord 'cried out,' or 'shouted,' which was not His wont. See Matt. xii. 19, where the same word is used. This is the only place where it is said that He did it. This loud cry was an anticipation of that other which all that are in the graves shall hear. What a moment it was! Who that stood by could ever forget it? In ver. 44, '*he that was dead*,' should be 'the dead man.' In ver. 47, read 'What are we doing, seeing that this man doeth,' etc. In ver. 49 it ought to stand, 'being high priest that year;' the words are the same as in ver. 51. In ver. 51, 'that Jesus was about to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but also that He might gather together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad.'

In ch. xii. 2, 'so they made Him a supper there.' In ver. 6, 'and kept the bag, and took away (purloined) what was put therein.' In ver. 13, 'Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel.' In ver. 14, '*when he had found*,' gives a wrong idea. It should be 'having found.' In ver. 17, for '*people*,' read 'multitude;' so also in vers. 18, 29, 34; and for '*record*,' 'witness.' In ver. 24, '*corn*' should be 'grain;' and '*alone*,' 'by itself alone.' In ver. 25, the word rendered '*life*' is the same as that rendered '*soul*' in ver. 27, and different from that rendered '*life*' at the end of this same verse. 'Soul' would perhaps *here* be better. In ver. 34, for '*Christ*,' read 'the Christ.' In ver. 35, for '*lest darkness come upon you*,' read 'that darkness overtake you not;' and for '*darkness*' below, 'the darkness.' In ver. 36, it ought to stand, 'that ye may become sons of light.' Ver. 41 should stand, 'These things said Esaias, because he saw His glory: and he spake of Him.' In ver. 43, read, 'they loved the glory that is of men more than the glory that is of God.'

In ch. xiii. 1, for '*when Jesus knew*' (which gives a false impression—viz., that He had been

ignorant of it, and at a certain time came to know it), read 'Jesus, knowing . . .' In ver. 2, for '*supper being ended*,' read 'when supper was begun.' Our translators mistook the meaning of the phrase. In ver. 7, for '*shalt know hereafter*,' read 'shalt understand afterwards;' there is no allusion to another life, but to future enlightenment in this life. In ver. 10, read 'He that hath been bathed, hath no need save to wash his feet;' —*i.e.*, one who has bathed, on reaching his home, needs not entire washing, but only to have his feet washed from the dust of the way. In ver. 11, 'He knew him that was betraying Him.' In ver. 16, read 'There is no servant greater than his lord, nor apostle greater,' etc. In ver. 17, the word rendered '*happy*,' should have been, as it is elsewhere, translated 'blessed.' In ver. 19, 'From this time I tell you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass,' etc. Verses 23-25, from inaccurate rendering, lose much of the graphic character of the original narrative. They should run thus: 'Now there was reclining at meat in Jesus' bosom, one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore maketh a sign to him, and saith unto him, Say, who it is of whom

He speaketh? He then, leaning back on Jesus' breast, saith unto him, Lord, who is it?' where observe, that the 'leaning back' was not the same as the 'reclining' mentioned before; but the beloved disciple, reclining as he was next our Lord, and thus in His bosom, when requested by St. Peter, leant back his head so as to be close to that of our Lord, and thus privately asked the question of Him. In ver. 27, for '*then said Jesus unto him*,' read 'Jesus therefore said unto him;' *therefore*, because now Satan had entered into him. In verses 37, 38, the words should stand thus: 'I will lay down my life for thee. Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down THY life for ME?' with strong emphasis on the words in capitals. We know why. The rash saying of the Apostle was a direct and startling reversal of the great work which Jesus came into the world to do—to lay down HIS life for every sinner.

In ch. xiv. 1, the imperative rendering, 'believe in God, believe also in me,' is far more probable than the indicative, 'ye believe,' etc. In ver. 9, for '*Hast thou not known* me,' read 'Dost thou not know me?' In ver. 18, for '*comfortless*,' read 'orphans.' In ver. 30, for '*Hereafter I will not*,' read 'I will no more.'

In ch. xv. 2, for '*purgeth*,' read 'cleanseth:' and for '*bring forth*,' 'bear,' as above: it is the same word in the original. Begin ver. 3, 'Ye are clean already by reason of.' In ver. 5, for '*bringeth forth*,' read again 'beareth' (it is one and the same word throughout); and instead of '*for without me*,' 'because apart from me.' This should have been carefully kept, because of its answering to the similitude of the branches, which cannot bear fruit *apart from* the vine. In ver. 6, for '*are burned*,' which would imply *being consumed*, it ought to be 'burn' (verb neuter), which implies '*go on burning*' (see Mark ix. 44, 46, 48). Begin ver. 15, 'No more call I you servants:' and ver. 16, 'Ye did not choose me, but I chose you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bear fruit,' etc. *Ordained* is objectionable, as introducing the idea of *appointing to the ministry*, which does not belong to this passage. Ver. 18 ought to stand, 'If the world hateth you, know that it hated me before you.' In ver. 27, for '*shall bear witness*,' read 'are witnesses.'

In ch. xvi. 2, read 'yea, an hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he offereth a service to God.' In ver. 4, read 'Nevertheless

these things have I spoken unto you, that when their hour is come,' etc. In ver. 7, 'It is expedient for you that I depart: for if I depart not, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I go, I will send Him to you:' the two former verbs expressing His leaving them; the third, His going to the Father. In ver. 8, for '*reprove*,' which is a most unfortunate word, far too weak for the meaning, read 'convict;' the work of the Spirit spoken of being within the hearts of individual men, bringing home to them the consciousness of the three things spoken of. In ver. 13, for '*all truth*,' read 'all the truth:' and end the verse, 'he shall tell you the things to come.' In the next verse, too, and in ver. 15, for '*shew*,' read 'tell.' In ver. 16, for '*ye shall not see me*,' read 'ye no longer behold me:' so also in verses 17, 19. In ver. 18, for '*a little while*,' read 'this little while:' and at end, 'we know not of what he speaketh.' In ver. 21, for '*joy*,' read 'her joy.' And ver. 25, 'These things have I spoken unto you in parables (or hard sayings, or allegories): an hour cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in parables, but shall tell you plainly concerning the Father.' In ver. 27, 'came *out*,' should be 'came forth,' as in

next verse. In ver. 29, for '*proverb*,' read 'parable.' In ver. 30, for '*are we sure*,' read 'know we:' it is the same verb as 'knowest,' which follows. In ver. 31, for '*Do ye now believe?*' read 'Ye do now believe.'

In ch. xvii. 2, read 'that whatsoever Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life.' In ver. 3, read 'to know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, even Jesus Christ.' Ver. 7 should begin, 'Now they know . . .:' and should end . . . 'from thee.' Ver. 9 would better begin, 'I am praying for them: I am not praying for the world,' etc., seeing that by and by our Lord does pray for the world: and this verse refers only to *this portion* of this prayer. In ver. 10, '*all mine*,' should be 'all things that are mine,' the gender being neuter in the original. In ver. 12, read 'those that Thou gavest me I guarded, and not one of them perished,' etc. In ver. 15, for '*the evil*,' substitute 'the evil one.' In ver. 17, for '*through thy truth*,' read 'in the truth:' and in ver. 19, 'in truth.' In ver. 20, omit '*shall*.' In ver. 24, the original text has 'Father, as to that which Thou hast given me, I will that they also be with me where I am.'

In ch. xviii. 4, for '*should come*,' read 'were coming.' In ver. 15, for '*another*,' read 'the other.' In ver. 25, for 'Art *not* thou . . . ?' read 'Art thou . . . ?' In ver. 28 (twice), for '*the hall of judgment*,' read 'the palace of the governor:' and at the end of the verse, 'that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover.' Begin ver. 29, 'So Pilate went out,' etc. In ver. 33, for '*judgment hall*,' read 'palace,' and so in ch. xix. 9. In ver. 34, for '*of me*,' read, for clearness, 'concerning me.' In ver. 36, 'my servants would have fought.' In ver. 37, 'To this end have I been born, and for this cause am I come into the world, that I may,' etc.

In ch. xix. 12, begin, 'Upon this Pilate,' etc. In ver. 25, Cleophas should be, as in the original, Clopas. Ver. 26 should begin, 'Jesus therefore seeing.' In ver. 27, '*that* disciple' should be, as before in the verse, 'the disciple.' In ver. 28, the word rendered '*accomplished*' is the same as that rendered 'finished' in ver. 30, and should have been rendered by the same. In the next verse read, 'So they filled a sponge with the vinegar, and fixed it upon a stalk of hyssop,' etc. In ver. 30, for '*gave up the ghost*,' which is become

a mere formula for the act of death, render, 'yielded up His spirit,' viz., in the words given by St. Luke, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit.' This yielding up His spirit was no mere coming on of death, but strictly a voluntary and determinate act. Begin ver. 32, 'So the soldiers came.' In ver. 35, for '*bare record*,' etc., read 'hath borne witness, and his witness is true.' In ver. 36, for '*were done*,' read 'came to pass.' In ver. 42, our version misses the peculiar arrangement of the original, which should have been preserved: 'There then, on account of the Jews' preparation day, because the sepulchre was nigh at hand, laid they Jesus.'

In ch. xx. 2, 'She runneth therefore.' In ver. 3, 'the other disciple, and they went toward the sepulchre.' Begin ver. 8, 'Then therefore,' and ver. 10, 'So the disciples,' etc. In ver. 18, for '*came and told*,' 'cometh, bringing tidings to.' In ver. 27, for '*thrust*,' read 'put:' it is the same word as before in ver. 25. In ver. 31, for '*through*,' read 'in.'

In ch. xxi. 1 (twice), and in ver. 14, for '*shewed*,' read 'manifested.' In ver. 3, for '*go*' (second time), read 'come:' and for '*a* ship,' 'the ship.'

In ver. 5, for '*meat*,' read 'fish.' In ver. 7, 'Simon Peter then, hearing that it was the Lord, girt,' etc. In ver. 11. for '*Simon Peter went up*,' read 'So Simon Peter went aboard:' and for '*broken*,' read 'rent.' In ver. 16, for '*feed*,' read 'keep.' Begin ver. 23, 'This saying therefore went abroad among the brethren, that that disciple was not to die: yet Jesus said not unto them that he was not to die,' etc.

The lists which I have given of necessary corrections in the Gospels, are but abridged ones. Many more would be added to the places mentioned, were the catalogues to aim at completeness. But I believe that of the more important corrections, not many will be found to have been passed over.

Even of the corrections here given, many may seem to a casual inspector unimportant. But I would entreat him, before he passes that judgment, to weigh well this: that no correction can be unimportant, which, by bringing the English text nearer to the original, while it retains the perspicuity of our own idiom, clears up to the unlettered reader the connexion of clauses in narrative or in discourse. A 'therefore' substituted for

a '*then*,' a 'but' for a '*now*,' may first let in light on a fact or a saying which before lacked it. See a notable instance of this in John iii. 1, where the same narrative, having stated that Jesus did not intrust himself to those in Jerusalem who followed Him, goes on to state an exception where He did commit himself to one who came to seek His teaching: 'But there was,' etc. And the intelligent and fair-judging reader may find numerous other examples, where the trifler and the scorner will find materials for their vocation, and treat the change with ridicule.

Respecting this whole subject, I may be permitted to say a word to my readers. Considerable fault has been found with me for venturing to hint at the fact that our authorized version needs correction at all. To shake the people's confidence in it was held to be ill-judged and mischievous. It will be seen that I have not been deterred from my course by such criticisms. The matter is too serious a one to be thus dealt with. It is a matter between the conscience of him who is treating of the Bible, and Him who gave us the Bible. If we really do believe that God has revealed to us His holy will and His blessed Son in the Bible, then, just in

proportion as that belief is living and efficient, will be our anxiety to have that His revelation transmitted to us as pure and as free from corruption and misrepresentation as may be. We derive the text of the Bible from testimony; from the testimony of various ancient manuscripts and versions, and quotations in the writings of ancient authors. Every man cannot weigh that evidence for himself. If I am of the number of those who can,—and who have devoted their labour for years to working among that evidence,—then just in proportion to my acquaintance with the evidence ought to be my anxiety that the text put into the hands of those who cannot examine for themselves, should be as pure and unalloyed as possible. Those persons, in a land and in a Church, who can contribute to this work of purifying the sacred text by bringing it into accordance with the most ancient authorities, are bound in conscience before God not to cast away their knowledge in unprofitable critical disquisitions, but to familiarize it for the benefit of their fellow-Christians. When our authorized version was made, very few, comparatively, of the ancient authorities were in the hands of those who were to decide on the text to be

adopted. The most important of them have never been examined thoroughly, some not discovered at all,—till our own time; and we are consequently now in a position to decide many doubtful matters as to 'various readings' which could not have been decided even in the times of our own fathers. And this being so, and feeling that this which has been given us will also be required of us, I shall not be deterred from bringing before the English reader the principal places in which our version needs correcting in its *readings* of the sacred text.

With regard to its *renderings* from the Greek into the English, let me also make a remark. If these are faultless: if no place can be pointed out in which our translators have evidently missed the sense of the original: nay, further, if it can be shown that all cases in which they may have seemed to do so are absolutely of no consequence, —then I acknowledge it would not be well to raise complaints, or to awaken dissatisfaction on inadequate grounds. Our authorized version is on the whole an admirable one. It is the greatest treasure in our literature, rich as we are in treasures. And in that place it is my earnest hope

and firm conviction that it will ever be maintained. But let us take heed what we are doing with regard to it. If it can be shown to contain renderings which have obscured or misrepresented the revealed will of God, if it can be shown to have fallen short of the sense of the sacred text, then this morbid conservatism of its words is nothing less than setting up the word of man against the word of God: and constitutes, as between God and our unlettered brethren, one of the most flagrant instances, among the many instances in our time, of *handling the word of God deceitfully.*

It is a common trick of those who deprecate all correction of our authorized version, to charge those who publish abroad the necessity for such correction, with *want of regard for the sacred text.* It is strange that it has never occurred to them, that just in proportion to a man's reverence for the sacred text, will be his anxiety to see it brought as near as possible to its original purity. If the charge is justified anywhere, it is surely as brought against men who are contented day after day, and year after year, to read as the Word of God, to others who have no means of judging for them-

selves, sentences which they must be aware form no part of that Word. We are never told that when we have the power of putting God's truth into men's hands, we are to abstain for fear of unsettling their minds: but one solemn thing we are told, which bears directly on this subject: 'To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.'

VI.

THE FOUR NARRATIVES OF THE PASSION.

IN order that we may be put in a condition the better to appreciate our present subject, we will spend some little time, by way of introduction, in considering the great closing events themselves, of which the Four Gospels contain separate narratives.

After a career of teaching and healing, of which the duration is variously computed at one year, three years, or five years, Jesus fell into the hands of His cruel enemies, and was put to death. Let us try to look on this as if we had been among those who followed Him. Of this termination to His course they had indeed been often forewarned, and especially with reference to, and during, His last journey to Jerusalem. But they had been

very slow to take in what they heard. They were doubtless aware of the growing enmity of the rulers and Pharisees; but they had not been, on the other hand, prepared for the triumph of His foes by any perceptible waning of His own manifestations of mercy and power. They had yet to learn what one of them set forth so grandly afterwards in his Gospel,—that the brighter the light shown, the more did the children of darkness hate it, and seek to quench it; and that the Lord's crowning miracle would bring out their final resolve that He should die. During that last journey, during that last eventful week of conflict, how bewildered must their spirits have been—how suspended between hope and fear! How mysterious must have seemed to them that anointing for His burial at Bethany; those nights spent on the Mount of Olives; that Paschal supper with its significant and valedictory institution; that long discourse, so full of calmness and majesty, in which, while consoling them and building them up with precious promises, He draws them, word by word, closer and deeper into the shadow of His sufferings; finally, how mysterious that sublime intercessory prayer, so full of the humility of

obedience, the joy of the glory to be resumed, the pleadings of love for His own!

Let us pass on to the dread scene of the agony and the betrayal. All the eleven Apostles had accompanied the Lord from the supper-chamber to the garden of Gethsemane. What befel Three of them there, we know. Their physical and mental state is sufficiently indicated, when we are told that He returned between the periods of His agony, and found them sleeping for sorrow. Nay, we had learned it before from His own words during His farewell discourse: 'Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart' (John xvi. 6). 'Sleeping for sorrow.' And who are they that sleep for sorrow? The mother watching her babe night and day, with the weight ever at her heart that her child will die,—worn out with fasting and unrest, is found sleeping for very sorrow: and the same mother, when she has looked dry-eyed on the placid corpse, and borne up even at the grave's brink, casts herself down on her solitary bed, and, with the solace of tears, finds the sleep that comes with sorrow. And even thus the Apostles, worn out with the sickness of hope deferred, darkened by that

shadow which they saw to be on their Lord, weighed down with apprehension of some terrible thing at hand, distracted moreover by rebel thoughts of mistrust and unbelief ever rising higher and bolder within them, slept for very sorrow. And as the Three whom the Lord took with Him, so the Eight who were left behind: for all behaved alike when the trial came. We seldom, I think, enter into the state of these Apostles, or ask ourselves what conflict they were passing through. For one who confessed like Peter, for one who was beloved like John, for one whose guileless heart at once recognised Him like Nathanael, for one who was ready to go into Judæa and die with Him like Thomas, for all who had heard his divine discourses, and drunk in life and joy at His lips, and stood at His hand while He wrought His miracles,—for such as these to forsake Him and fly,—what anguish, what terror, what bitter dereliction of the very life's hopes must there have been! How must all constancy, all resolve, all repose and balance of character, have been shaken to pieces by that rude crash which scattered the sheep when the Shepherd was smitten!

I dwell on these things, because they are important elements for our present consideration. That promised inspiration of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, which brought back to their remembrance the things which Jesus had said unto them, and thus empowered them for the construction of the Gospel narrative, acted, we may presume to suppose, though in a high and especial manner, yet in accordance with the well-known analogy of His other operations. He did not supersede, but He elevated, their human testimony. In delivering it, they were assisted and enabled by Him; but within the limits of their human characters and the evidence of their human senses. 'He that saw it bare record, and his record is true.' 'Ye also shall bear witness, *because ye have been with me from the beginning.*' And when the Apostles, after the Ascension, came to choose a successor to the traitor Judas, the extent and completeness of his human testimony was the indispensable condition of his becoming with the Apostles a witness to the truth of the Resurrection of the Lord. The circumstances then under which the human testimony of each was gathered would, we may fairly presume, gave a tinge to the

narrative itself; and it would be no wonder if great revulsions of feeling, and deep conflicts of spirit, left their traces even on the style of Apostles.

Their Lord was apprehended, led away, judged, buffeted, taken forth as a malefactor, crucified openly, buried. Where were they? What were their thoughts? Something of their state of mind we learn from the beautiful fragments preserved to us of their sayings and doings on that day of the Resurrection. Their hopes had died within them. Even St. Peter, when he went in and saw the empty tomb, knew not what had happened, but departed, wondering in himself at that which had come to pass. It was reserved for the beloved disciple to see and believe: but even he, up to this moment, knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. And the two, as they went to Emmaus, spoke of the whole fair fabric of their hopes as a matter gone by: 'We trusted it had been He which should have redeemed Israel.'

We can hardly doubt that the disciples for the most part abandoned heart and hope during those dark three days—that there was a gap, so to speak,

in the continuity of their belief in Jesus as a living and present power.

The holy women, constant in their love, probably formed no exception to this. Mary Magdalene, when she found the tomb empty, thought of nothing but that the body of her Lord had been taken away. It was not till the well-known voice had pronounced her own name, that recognition flashed upon her. The very meeting of the Apostles and disciples on that day was probably prompted by the reports heard from the women. When the Two returned from Emmaus, we are told that they found the Eleven gathered together, and them that were with them—evidently indicating that it was an unexpected thing, and had arisen from the fact which was immediately announced to the travellers —that the Lord was risen indeed, and had appeared unto Simon.

And here let me notice a very important point with regard to the truth of this part of the Gospel history. Without the Resurrection, it seems to me that it is impossible to account for the revival of belief in Jesus as the Christ, and for the existence of the Christian Church. The leading characters among the Apostles are pretty well known to us.

And we say safely say, that never were men so unlikely to have gathered up their broken hopes, and concocted a scheme of deliberate and crafty falsehood, requiring the utmost presence of mind and power of invention to carry it out. One only way is there of accounting for their meeting together afresh, and forming the compact and unyielding and influential body that they did—namely, that He over whom and whose prospects they mourned as lost, had risen from the dead and appeared to them again. This fact of the Resurrection is the foundation of Christianity, and, accordingly, no fact in history has ever been so attested. I defy the unbeliever to point out any portion of recorded human testimony which bears so unmistakably on its face the impress of truth. Wonderful indeed has been the Providence of God as concerning the narrative of these facts, upon which all we have and hope depends. As the day was, so is the story: a great outburst of sudden joy; hurried, fragmentary: idle tales found to be true: the uniform course of nature broken up: hopes and prospects untold, once more opened to the soul. A day of heaven and not of earth: a day of running and seeing, and running and telling: first

Mary Magdalene, then Simon Peter, then the Two from Emmaus;—and then, O joy not unmixed with awe,—the Lord Himself is there in the midst of them! Who should sit down and chronicle such a day? Each told, or told not, what befel each. That blessed interview by the garden tomb, that sound thenceforth ever heard through life,—'Mary!'—what stranger could ever intermeddle with her joy? So she confided it to the beloved Apostle, and the Spirit shut it safe in his heart, and long years after he wrote it at Ephesus. That appearance to the penitent Peter has never been told, nor that other to the Lord's brother: the visit of the women in the morning is given us from several points of view, and we lack the clew which shall lead us into the place whence we may see them as one: that most beautiful of all narrated incidents, the journey to Emmaus, was educed by the patient and accurate inquiry of St. Luke: the appearance to the assembled Eleven is so related by the two, St. Luke and St. John, that only the observant reader recognises that pointed at by the narratives as one and the same.

What can be greater and more undeniable signs of truth, than these fragmentary and appar-

ently discordant accounts? Had the Resurrection been a fiction, this would have been better managed, all would have fitted accurately together; or if the semblance of independence in the accounts had been fraudulently given, the eye of posterity would have detected the imposture.

And yet, the enemies of the faith are stupid enough to triumph over these superficial discrepancies: and yet, still more wonderful, the *friends* of the faith are stupid enough to *deny* the discrepancies—to repudiate the independence of the accounts—and with their own hands to blunt the weapons which God has given them to fight His battles withal. There never was stronger testimony furnished to any facts, than this of these Four independent witnesses, relating that which had come to their knowledge, each from his own point of view, each aided by the Holy Spirit to use, not to cast off, his individual observation and memory; but the moment we make them dependent on each other, the value of their testimony is so far diminished; the moment you succeed in proving that their accounts of the same events are not from autoptic authority, but from one another, you weaken the fourfold cord. As the narratives

now stand, all bears the stamp of truth: every incident is fresh from the heart of one who saw it, or had collected its details from those that saw it. Careless about collusion to bring right those minutiæ which always will look different in honest independent narratives,—strong in uprightness of purpose, faithful in recording the impressions of the time, filled with the enabling and reminding power of the Holy Teacher vouchsafed to them, the Evangelists have bequeathed to the Church a history of which it may be said that truth looks forth from every line of it, and that none but matters of fact could be so related.

With these remarks, let us now speak more in detail of these four histories of the Passion and Resurrection. I shall take the principal events in order, remarking on any particulars which may require notice in the Gospels which relate them.

I. *The anointing at Bethany:* John xii. 1-11; Mark xiv. 3-9; Matt. xxvi. 6-13. Omitted altogether by St. Luke. We are here at once met by some difficulties, but not of a formidable kind. St. John could not but be acquainted with the

general current and contents of the apostolic oral narrative. Traces of this are here and there unmistakably visible in his Gospel: in places where he fixes what that tradition had left indefinite, or fills up what it incompletely reported. And when he here states that the anointing took place '*six days before the passover*,' and that the triumphal entry followed on the morrow, we may feel certain that he is thus fixing what had been left unfixed. As related in St. Matthew and St. Mark, it would at first sight appear as if it happened several days later: for they have first the triumphal entry, then a long series of incidents and discourses, and then the anointing. But on looking for a reason for this arrangement, we at once perceive that it has arisen from a desire rather to *group subjects together*, than to relate what happened in order of time. The anointing is in both these Evangelists closely connected with the treachery of Judas, which again leads immediately on to the betrayal and the Passion. But now, what reason could there be why the two Evangelists should connect the anointing with the treachery of Judas, seeing that he is not mentioned in its history? St. John again gives us the reason. St. Matthew had said that

the disciples were indignant at the waste: St. Mark, that *there were some* who were indignant. But turn to St. John, and we find that it was Judas Iscariot who complained of the waste, and are told why he did so: gaining thereby a most valuable inlet into the motive of the dark treachery which followed. Notice, that St. Matthew's account, agreeing verbally in many particulars with St. Mark's, is shorter and less precise. The curious designation of the ointment ('pistick') found in the other two, is omitted: as is the price for which the murmurers alleged it might have been sold, also found in the other two; the fact that they murmured *against the woman*, given by St. Mark; and the words, 'She hath wrought a good work on me.' St. Mark alone gives us the detail, that 'she brake the box,' and then shed forth the ointment on the head of our Lord. But, of all three, St. John is by far the fullest. We at once feel ourselves to be in the presence of an eye-witness. From him alone we learn *who* the woman was. He sets before us the household, and tells us who served, and what remarkable guest was present. And here we find what appears a slight discrepancy. In the two others, Mary pours the ointment over

the Head of Jesus: in St. John she anoints His Feet, and wipes them with the hair of her head. Both accounts are strict and accurate. We cannot, as sometimes, correct one by the other. St. Matthew has, 'poured it upon His head:' St. Mark, 'poured it down over His head.' No question, this must be taken to the letter. She did thus pour it, and St. John omits this part of the transaction. Perhaps, because the other part was more nearly connected with the next particular which he mentions—that the house was filled with the smell of the ointment. This may have first attracted his own attention, and when he looked, Mary may have come to the second part of her good work. Or, there may be a more probable reason still. It is likely at least, that St. John on this occasion may have occupied the same position as we know he did at the Last Supper; resting on the couch next to, and in the bosom of our Lord. If this were so, and if the anointing on the Head took place before the other, it would not be observed by the beloved Apostle, being, in fact, behind him. But the anointing on the Feet would pass under his very eye: and, cautious as he ever is to select those incidents which he him-

self witnessed, this, and not the other, would find place in his narrative.

Moreover from St. John we also learn who was the murmurer on the occasion. The chief secondary lesson of the history is contained in his Gospel alone. The murmuring of the disciples in general, rebuked as it was by our Lord, may seem to have been the natural feeling, and the rebuke to have sprung from the solemn and exceptional character of the occasion: but when we know that the murmurer was also the Traitor,—when we reflect that the same lips which said, 'To what purpose was this waste?' also said, 'What will ye give me and I will betray Him unto you?'—we feel that all niggardly repining at the cost of deeds of love is for ever silenced.

II. Another, and a scarcely less interesting point of comparison between the Gospels is, *the Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem.* Judging from the Three, we might suppose that it happened on the same day as the journey from Jericho, and as the termination of that journey. This is not indeed anywhere asserted, but it would be the natural inference. There is no

break in the narrative. Nay, in St. Luke, the idea of immediate continuity is almost forced on us by the spirit of the context: compare Luke xix. verses 28 and 29, with verses 37 and 41. But all doubt on this matter is at once removed by St. John. In his Gospel, the triumphal entry follows on the anointing at Bethany, with the precise detail, '*On the morrow*, a great multitude,' etc. So that on His way from Jericho He halted for the night at Bethany. It probably was the Friday evening, which in the Jewish computation was the beginning of the Sabbath. And if so, St. John's expression, 'On the morrow,' need not bind us to believe that the triumphal entry took place during the hours of the Sabbath, which it hardly could have done. For, knowing as we do from St. Mark (xi. 11) that it took place *in the evening*, the Sabbath would then be over, and the next day, according to the same computation, begun.

But our comparison of the four accounts brings before us another remarkable circumstance. In the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the cleansing of the Temple is related as having taken place on occasion of the solemn entry.

On this St. John is silent. Having already related in his second chapter the cleansing of the Temple on a former occasion, he passes it over now. But from St. Mark (xi. 11) we have, as so often, a valuable detail not found in the others. It is, that on this occasion the Lord only looked round upon all things, and as it was now late, returned to Bethany. Then on the morrow, He went into the city, and purified the Temple.

But now comes in another detail, respecting which also there is apparent variation. According to St. Matthew, on the day after the triumphal entry, and the cleansing of the Temple (for so the words 'Early in the morning,' following the other narrative, imply), our Lord cursed the barren fig-tree by the way. 'And,' adds the Evangelist, 'the fig-tree immediately (not *presently*, as our authorized version, which is hardly fair) withered away.' Now here again St. Mark furnishes us with the right clue. It *was* on the morning after the triumphal entry, but not after the cleansing of the Temple, which St. Matthew, as we saw, has inserted a day too soon. It was on the way to the cleansing of the Temple, that the cursing of the fig-tree took place: it was on the way into

Jerusalem again the *next* morning, that its having withered away was noticed by the disciples.

III. The next point of comparison in the four accounts is, *the treachery of Judas.* The way for this has been long ago prepared in St. John's Gospel. As early as ch. vi. 70, 71, he relates to us an instance of our Lord's prescience as regarded Judas, which must have occurred not long after the choosing of the Apostles. But St. John gives no formal account of the compact with the chief priests, which the other Three relate. In St. Matthew and St. Mark, this narrative follows immediately on that of the anointing at Bethany, where, as we learn from St. John, he had been the murmurer. St. Luke's account bears traces of relation with that of St. John, in the words 'then entered Satan into Judas,' etc. (compare John xiii. 22). And from this, one might be disposed to think that the two narratives pointed to one and the same time. This, however, is hardly possible; for the compact with the chief priests, by its very terms, must have been made some days before the betrayal took place. And here we may notice (1.) that the amount of the

treachery-money is mentioned by St. Matthew only, and that for the purpose of adducing the prophecy in which that amount is specified. (2.) That the announcement made by our Lord, that one of the Twelve was about to betray Him, is related by all four Evangelists: by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John in the same words, with the addition of 'he that eateth with me,' in St. Mark. That here, as in the other cases where the same event is narrated by the Four, St. John's account goes the most minutely into that which regarded himself and the part which he bore in the matter, while the others (St. Luke in this case being an exception, giving only a summary account) relate more of the general action among the Apostles. (3.) That with regard to the act of treachery itself, it being in the apprehension of our Lord, St. John in this case, as so often when a fact was already sufficiently related by the apostolical tradition, and there was no *special* reason for incorporating it in his work, omits the account of the capture; but as to that which happened before it, including our Lord's word of power which struck His enemies (and Judas with them) to the ground, St. John's is our only

account, and it is most precise and graphic. He only tells us of the lanterns and torches as well as weapons; the minute accuracy of an eye-witness relating the impression which he retained all those years is in the words, 'And Judas also, which was his betrayer, was standing with them.' He only again gives us the important notice, that 'Judas knew the place, because Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his desciples.' As regards the incident of Peter's sudden blow, we have it from all Four: and it is instructive to notice the narrative of each. St. Matthew alone gives us the wonderful saying of the King of Angels and the Son of God: 'Thinkest thou not that I can now ask my Father, and He shall give me (set by my side to defend me) more than twelve (not Apostles, but) legions of angels?' St. Mark, in this case (and it is a rare one with him) abridges what happened, barely stating the fact, and giving no particular which is not mentioned by the others. St. Luke in this instance is very precise and full. He tells us that it was the *right* ear, and adds the important circumstance that Jesus, having besought those that held Him to grant Him thus much liberty, touched his ear and healed him.

But hitherto we have been in uncertainty as to who was the striker. '*One of those with Jesus*,' says St. Matthew. '*One of the standers by*,' says St. Mark (there must have been some urgent motive for concealment, when the companion of the doer of the deed was permitted to write thus). '*A certain one from among them*,' says St. Luke. But St. John, writing perhaps long years after, repeats again the incident, contrary to his usual practice, but this time with a sufficient reason :— the name of the striker is given,—it is—Simon Peter. (4.) We come to the sequel of the dark history. And here, of the writers of the *Gospels*, we are beholden to St. Matthew, alone. The despair of the wretched man, when he found that his deed had really been the cause of his righteous Master's condemnation, his casting down the blood-money in the temple and going and hanging himself, these incidents are peculiar to St. Matthew. In the second treatise of St. Luke we have another account, evidently independent of that in St. Matthew, and, with our scanty knowledge of the circumstances as they were, hardly by us reconcilable with it. It is just one of those cases in which the Christian sound and

healthy in the faith must be content to believe for the present that both accounts are true, and that he will one day be permitted to see that they are : meantime being willing to walk by faith, not by sight, and firm in resisting all attempts, which well-meaning men will be sure to make, to induce him to give up the plain sense of words, and commit little dishonesties, to bring both into accord.

IV. In the accounts of *the leading away of the Lord after His apprehension*, we have, from St. Mark, the unexplained incident of the young man clothed with a linen garment, who, being laid hold of, left it and fled from them naked. On the question who this was, conjectures have not been wanting, one of the most extraordinary being that recently put forth—not, it is true, in sober prose —that it was the lately-resuscitated Lazarus. We may well conceive that some other reason besides the accuracy of a graphic narrator must have gained for this incident its place in the history.

We also have from St. John the important notice that our Lord's first hearing was before Annas, the rightful but deposed High-Priest, and that from

Annas he was sent bound to Caiaphas, the actual High-Priest of that year. But here comes in a remarkable circumstance in the narrative of St. Luke, as apparently distinguished from the rest. Undoubtedly, the impression derived from the three other Evangelists is that our Lord was taken before the High-Priest and the council, and questioned, as related, during the night; and that then in the morning a council was held, at which the final determination was come to, that He should be put to death, which resulted in His being delivered over to Pilate, the Roman governor. Now in the narrative of St. Luke, we read (ch. xxii. 54), that they took Him (that night) to the house of the High-Priest; and then, Peter's denials having happened meantime, in the morning the Sanhedrim is assembled, and our Lord is questioned, in the same manner as the other Evangelists make Him to have been questioned by the High-Priest during the night. But there is no real difficulty in this. In the private hearing before the High-Priest, and in the public hearing before the whole council, what more likely than that the questions should have followed the same regular form? In St. Luke's narrative we have traces of the presence of Jesus

during the denials of Peter, in the words, 'the Lord turned and looked upon Peter.' Then again, in the whole process before the council in that Evangelist we have indications that it was not a first, but a second hearing. No evidence is mentioned as having been taken; but the council at once begin with, 'If thou art the Christ, tell us.' I should be disposed to regard St. Luke's as the strictly exact account of what took place before the council in the morning, and that of St. Matthew and St. Mark as a general summary of what happened at both hearings, put together.

V. We now come to another point of comparison between all four Evangelists: the narrative of *the denials of Peter.*

And here let us notice first, the terms in which the announcement of the denials is made in each Evangelist. In Matthew, Luke, and John it is that the cock shall not crow ('in this night,' Matt.; 'to-day,' Luke) before he had denied Jesus thrice. In St. Mark alone we have the more precise account—'this day, in this night, before the cock has crowed *twice* thou shalt thrice deny Me.' And in the narrative of the denials the same distinction

is observed. The agreements and differences in the four will be best seen by the table on page 197, which is familiar to readers of my Greek Testament.

Now, if Peter denied his Lord *in words* three times, and *three times only*, we have here an insuperable difficulty. But there is no need to make any such supposition, and there is in fact no difficulty at all. The facts were these: on three distinct occasions during this night was Peter charged with being a disciple of Jesus; on each of these occasions did he deny his Master. He was on each occasion among a crowd. A charge of this kind, made by one, would be taken up by others, and only dropped upon his repeated asseverations to the contrary. Nay, in the second denial in St. John, and the third in St. Matthew and St. Mark, as much as this is distinctly implied: 'Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. *They said* therefore to him' (John xviii. 25): many, the standers by, as expressed in Matt. xxvi. 73, Mark xiv. 70. And the same diversity and repetition on Peter's part is implied, when St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us that he began to curse and to swear: he uttered many asseverations, accompanied with

oaths and imprecations on himself if what he said were not true. So that we have room for all that is related, and more. And even where the Evangelists appear not in accord, as in the account of the second denial by St. Matthew and St. John (he 'had gone out into the porch,' St. Matt.; 'he was standing and warming himself,' St. John), it may well have been so—the renewed asseverations may have begun round the fire, and Peter may have gone out into the porch, or fore-court, to escape, and have there been charged by the maid-servant in waiting. On the whole, as we might expect, the most precise detail is owing to St. John, who alone tells us of the peculiar reason of the third recognition, that the speaker was his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off. It is remarkable that another and distinct reason for this third denial is given by St. Matthew and St. Mark, and hinted at by St. Luke. Peter was a Galilean, and betrayed by his dialect. Lastly, let us notice the conclusions of the four accounts. Here St. Luke's narrative has all the precision of the report of an eye-witness, 'Immediately, *while he was yet speaking*, the cock crew.' And he alone has retained for us that look of the Lord which brought repent-

ance to the faithless disciple. Of all this, St. John merely mentions that immediately the cock crew: while St. Mark,—with the particular detail that it was the second time, according to our Lord's saying,—has used, to describe Peter's repentance, a remarkable and difficult word, best, perhaps, rendered as we have it, in our authorized version, 'when he thought thereon,' but capable of several other meanings, among which one is, 'covering his head with his cloak.'

The whole comparison remarkably shows us how the four Evangelists, essentially independent, fill out and confirm one another. We shall find more instances of this as we advance through the audience before Pilate, the Crucifixion, the Burial, and the Resurrection.

	MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.	JOHN.
1st denial.	Sitting in the hall without, is charged by a maid-servant with having been with Jesus the Galilæan. 'I know not what thou sayest.'	Warming himself in the hall below,—etc. as Matt.—goes out into the vestibule—cock crows. 'I know not, neither understand what thou sayest.'	Sitting—'*by the light*,' is recognised by the maid and charged—replies, 'Woman, I know Him not.'	Is recognised by the porteress on being introduced by the other disciple. 'Art not thou also one of this man's disciples?' He saith, 'I am not.'
2d denial.	He has gone out into the porch—*another* maid sees him. 'This man also was with Jesus of Nazareth.' He denies with an oath, 'I do not know the man.'	The same maid (possibly: but not necessarily) sees him again, and says, 'This man is of them.' He denies again.	Another (but a *male* servant) says: 'Thou also art of them.' Peter said, 'Man, I am not.'	Is standing and warming himself. They said to him, 'Art not thou also of His disciples?' He denied, and said, 'I am not.'
3d denial.	After a little while, the standers-by say, 'Surely thou art of them; for thy dialect betrayeth thee.' He began to curse and to swear: 'I know not the man.'	As Matt. 'Surely thou art of them: for thou art also a Galilæan.'	After about an hour, another persisted saying. 'Truly this man was with Him, for he is a Galilæan.' Peter said, 'Man, I know not what thou sayest.'	One of the slaves of the High-priest, his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, says, 'Did I not see thee in the garden with Him?' Peter then denied again
	Immediately the cock crew, and Peter remembered, etc.—and going out he wept bitterly.	A second time the cock crew, and Peter remembered, etc.—and when he thought thereon, he wept.	Immediately while he was yet speaking the cock crew, and the Lord turned and looked on Peter, and Peter remembered, etc.—and going out he wept bitterly.	Immediately the cock crew.

VI. The *hearing before Pilate* is the next point of comparison between our four Evangelists. It has been already remarked that St. Luke, and he only, gives us notice of the second hearing of our Lord before the High-Priest and the Sanhedrim having taken place in the morning. Had it not been for his narrative, we should have imagined that those hearings were over the night before, and that the first incident in the morning was the leading Him away to Pilate. Arrived before the Roman governor, they began, according to St. Luke, to charge Him with perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, calling himself Christ, a King. According to St. John, Pilate comes out to them, and asking them what charge they brought against Him, gets but a vague answer, and thereupon bids them take Him and judge Him by their law. On this they reply that it is not allowed them to put any one to death; whereat Pilate goes into the Prætorium, and asks Jesus whether He is the King of the Jews. This question, be it observed, presupposes the information having been laid as St. Luke tells us it was; or how should Pilate have had this question suggested to him?

At this point all four narratives agree. The question, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' is related by all in the same words. But in what follows there is great resemblance of diversity. The Three give for our Lord's answer, 'Thou sayest it.' Then St. Matthew and St. Mark represent our Lord as accused vehemently by the chief priests (and elders), and answering nothing, either to them or, as in St. Mark, to the governor himself. Here, however, St. John gives us the details of a long and deeply-interesting conversation between the Prisoner and His judge, in which the kinghood of our Lord, and the nature of His kingdom, and His having come into the world to testify to the truth, of which Pilate knows nothing, are asserted. This took place *within* the Prætorium; whereas the vehement accusations by the chief priests and elders must of necessity have been made *without;* for Pilate says to our Lord, 'Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?' And thus all discrepancy is removed. In the presence of His accusers He answered nothing, not even to the governor; but when within the Prætorium, He held the conversation which St. John gives us. At the close of

this, and after asking 'What is truth?' Pilate came out to them, and announced his persuasion of our Lord's innocence: *again*, says St. John, because his former question, 'What charge bring ye against this man?' yet unanswered, was his first declaration to that effect.

And now comes in an important portion of the narrative, for which we are beholden to St. Luke alone. In their rejection of Pilate's acquittal of their prisoner, the chief priests had mentioned *Galilee* as the supposed scene of His seditious attempts. On this Pilate sends Him to Herod, who, having insulted Him, and clothed Him with a scarlet robe, sends Him back to Pilate. A source of information connected with the family of Herod, and open to St. Luke, may be indicated by his having enumerated (ch. viii. 3) Joanna, *wife of Chuza, Herod's steward*, among the women who attended on Him and ministered to Him of their substance. Thus an incident of this kind, which in the mere summary account of the events of the day had been absorbed in the greater parts, would be recalled to the diligent investigator St. Luke.

We have now then our Lord again presented to His persecutors, with the renewed declaration of

His innocence from Pilate, strengthened also, as in St. Luke, by the fact that Herod had not thought Him worthy of punishment. Pilate is anxious to release Him; he will chastise Him and let Him go; he tries to get them to choose Him as the prisoner to be given them at the feast. But Barabbas is preferred; and here we have again the united testimony of the Four; St. Matthew adding the interesting particular of the message from Pilate's wife. On this fact more may rest than at first might appear. Undoubtedly there does seem to have been a previous acquaintance on the part of the Roman governor with our Lord and His character, to which this incident may furnish a clue. We owe the account of Pilate having washed his hands also to St. Matthew.

Here, then, we have the release of Barabbas related by the Three, and implied by St. John; and the scourging of Jesus: this latter being related by all but St. Luke, and by him included in the words, 'Pilate decreed that their request should be granted;' for it was usual with the Romans to scourge criminals before execution.

Previously to His being led away to be crucified, all but St. Luke relate to us His mockery by the

soldiers, the crown of thorns, the purple robe, the saluting Him as King of the Jews. St. Luke has told us that the purple robe had been before put on Him by Herod, and he passes over the rest of this portion of the narrative.

But here the last Evangelist again interposes with a weighty history of the end of this eventful audience, which the rest had not given us. The bringing forth of Jesus after His mocking by the soldiers, the final declaration of His innocence, the fear of Pilate on hearing that He had called Himself the Son of God,—the entering in again, and the declaration by the Prisoner of the source of the judge's power,—the fresh determination of Pilate to release Him, and how that determination was finally overborne,—all of these, so important in the account to be given of the governor's ultimate decision, we get only from the disciple who was known to the High-Priest, and who seems on this occasion to have been present where others could not.

And now the four narratives join again at the point where our Lord, being by Pilate delivered to the will of His enemies, is led away to be crucified.

VII. *The Crucifixion.*—Here St. John begins by summing up very shortly the leading away and the incidents of the *crucifixion* properly so called. From St. Matthew and St. Mark we have the fact, that they took off from Jesus the purple robe and put on Him His own garments; from all Three, that the cross was laid on Simon the Cyrenian, to bear it; St. Mark adding a personal notice, that he was *father of Alexander and Rufus;* St. Luke, that he bore the cross *after Jesus.*

But now we have from St. Luke, the careful inquirer in Jerusalem, the detail respecting our Lord turning to the women that wept and bewailed Him. I shall have occasion to notice by and by, that details of this peculiar character especially belong to St. Luke's narrative of the Passion and Resurrection. On the name of the place to which our Lord was taken, all are agreed. St. John gives the explanation, that Golgotha was its *Hebrew* appellation, while St. Luke omits that name altogether, and (in the genuine text) tells us that it was called Cranium, 'a skull,' thereby showing us that 'the place of a skull,' which it is called in the others, is to be understood, not of skulls lying about there (which could not well be, in the

care of the Jews to escape pollution), but of some natural conformation of the hill or rock resembling a skull when seen from a distance.

Being arrived there, the Roman soldiers, whose office it was, despoil our Lord of His garments, and nail Him to the cross. It is this which gives significance to the prayer of Jesus here preserved to us by St. Luke: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' They were but blindly performing that which came in the course of their daily duty. It is full of interest to reflect that the Evangelist who relates this incident, is also he who tells us of the pious centurion Cornelius, and the devout soldier who waited upon him. I might add, he who, as the companion of St. Paul, must have been much and often in intercourse with the Roman soldiery, and likely to hear from them more than others. It is notable also in connexion with this, that St. Luke is the Evangelist who gave us so minute and accurate an account, in his seventh chapter, of the healing of the centurion's servant. With regard to two being crucified with our Lord, one on either side, all are in accord. In St. Matthew and St. Mark they are robbers, in St.

Luke, malefactors; in St. John they are merely called 'other two.'

A title was placed over the cross, that is, on the upright portion seen above the head, on which the name and description of the crime were inscribed. This title was, according to St. Matthew, 'This is Jesus, the King of the Jews;' according to St. Mark, 'The King of the Jews;' according to St. Luke, 'This is the King of the Jews;' according to St. John, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.' This latter, as the fuller form, has generally been taken as the actual Greek inscription. St. John also tells us that it was written in the three current languages,—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, —and gives the additional anecdote that the Jews wished to have the title altered, but Pilate refused. It is observable that the words, 'The King of the Jews,' at which the Jews were offended, are common to all four forms of the title; constituting as they did the offence, for which the punishment had been ostensibly inflicted.

Now follows (I am taking St. John's order of events) the incident, common to the Four, of the casting lots for the tunic of Jesus. St. John gives us the reason for this, and connects it with the

prophecy in the 22d Psalm. The verse in St. Matthew which cites the prophecy is spurious, not being found in any of the most ancient authorities.

The mocking on the cross by the passers-by and the chief priests and scribes, is given at most length by St. Matthew. St. Mark joins him in reporting the taunt about rebuilding the Temple in three days; St. Mark and St. Luke in reporting 'He saved others, himself He cannot save,' or 'Let Him save Himself if He is the Christ, the chosen of God.' All Three agree in joining with this a taunt respecting His being King of Israel; but again St. Luke tells us that it was the *soldiers*, as they offered Him vinegar (sour wine), who thus reproached Him. St. Matthew alone tells us that in thus reviling Him they used the very words of the Messianic Psalm xxii., 'He trusted in God; let Him deliver Him now, if He will have Him.' St. Matthew and St. Mark relate that the thieves who were crucified with Him reviled Him ('*in the same manner*,' adds St. Matthew). Had we but this statement, we certainly should depart with a wrong impression of that which really happened. St. Luke, who seems throughout this part of the

history to be in possession of accurate information which the others had not, relates that it was one only of the thieves who thus reviled the Lord, and adds the history, so familiar to every Christian mind, of the penitent, and of the gracious promise made to him.

Of the whole incidents of this period St. John gives us but one; that one, however, is of deep interest: the committal of the mother of our Lord, by his dying command, to the care of the disciple whom Jesus loved. When we consider that there were then living four of the brethren of our Lord, and that St. John was not related to him in the flesh, this incident must ever be full of mystery: whether we consider these brethren as His true brothers by the same mother,—as children of Joseph by a former marriage,—or as His cousins; for whichever view we take, we cannot remove the difficulty of His having set aside the ties of kindred in committing so sacred a trust, and preferring to them those of holy friendship.[1]

[1] Professor Lightfoot, in his recent edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, assumes that this difficulty bears wholly on the hypothesis of the Lord's brethren being sons of Joseph and Mary, and that the other hypotheses are free from it. But surely it bears on all, though not on all in exactly the same degree. If, as Professor Lightfoot main-

And now the solemn end approaches. The supernatural darkness is related by the Three in almost the same terms. No stress is to be laid on St. John's not mentioning any given fact in the history: he does not repeat incidents already furnished by the ordinary apostolic tradition, except some special reason moves him to do so. The great cry of the suffering Redeemer, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' is given, in different forms of the common Hebrew dialect of Palestine, by St. Matthew and St. Mark only. The bystanders, in derision, give Him vinegar on a sponge, in answer, St. John informs us, to His cry of 'I thirst,' and after this, He cried out again with a loud voice, and expired. What this cry was, we are expressly told by St. John: 'When then Jesus had received the vinegar, He said, "It is finished," and bowing His head He delivered up His spirit.' Nor is this inconsistent with St. Luke's equally detailed account, that 'Jesus crying (or, when He had cried) with a loud voice, said, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my

tains, they were sons of Joseph by a former marriage, the setting them aside for a stranger to the family was surely a step almost as unaccountable as if they were sons of Joseph and Mary.

spirit:" and when He had said this, He expired.' For *this may be* the cry 'delivering up His spirit,' of which we were told by St. John, and the *loud cry* may be the 'It is finished.'

And now follow the portents which accompanied the Saviour's death, related in most detail by St. Matthew; St. Mark and St. Luke noticing only the rending of the veil of the Temple, which St. Luke appears to place during the darkness and before the Lord's death. The mysterious addition is given by St. Matthew, that 'the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept were raised up, and went out of the tombs after His resurrection, and entered into the holy city, and appeared to many.' These words suggest to us many questions, which only the fuller knowledge of the blessed state to come will enable us to answer: Who were these that were raised? What was it that happened at the moment of the Lord's death? Were the graves only opened, and did the raising of the bodies happen, as we might expect, after He, the first-fruits, was raised? Not so, says the narrative, but, which is surprising, that the bodies were raised now, at the death of the Lord, and that they awaited His resurrection to

come out of the tombs and enter into the holy city and appear to many. We may notice here a mark of consistency uniting the end of the first Gospel with the beginning—the appellation of '*the holy city*' to designate Jerusalem : the same which had occurred in St. Matthew's narrative of the temptation.

The effect on the centurion ('and those who with him watched Jesus :' so St. Matthew) is given in similar terms by all Three. But in St. Matthew it is the earthquake and attendant circumstances which make the impression ; in St. Mark, the manner of the Lord's death ; in St. Luke, simply 'that which happened.' Here, again, we have St. Luke doubtless giving us the exact words used by the centurion, whilst all the others relate rather that which those words implied ; for if our Lord was a just and true man, He was the Son of God, for He had given Himself out so to be.

The solemn account terminates with the notice that the women who had followed Him from Galilee were looking on from afar ; and St. Matthew and St. Mark enumerate four who were among them. St. Luke adds to them 'all His acquaintance,' and tells us, evidently again from his testi-

mony collected at Jerusalem, that all the multitudes who flocked together to the spectacle, when they saw what had happened, returned beating their breasts. A notice indeed remarkable and worth pondering. That day's event, in other words, produced dismay and anguish among the spectators; the taunts and jeers of the passers-by are heard no more; are forgotten in the presence of the darkness, and the trembling of the earth, and the superhuman cry of the Sufferer; and those who just now were shouting 'Come down and save thyself,' are inwardly sighing 'Woe unto us, for we have slain the just; for this day's deed will rise up in judgment against us.'[1]

And now the beloved disciple has his express

[1] It will be observed that I have said nothing of the remarkable discrepancy between St. Mark and St. John as to the *hour* of the crucifixion, the former relating that it was the '*third hour when they crucified Him*' (xv. 25), and the latter that it was the *sixth hour* when Pilate said to the Jews, 'Behold your King!' (xix. 14.) It is quite impossible for us to reconcile these statements by any information we at present possess. It must be quite clear, on the one hand, that there could never really exist such a difference as this between any two accounts of this memorable day; and on the other hand, that no difference in the method of counting the hours of the day can be supposed as a solution for the difficulty. St. John had the Apostolic tradition before him which used *one* reckoning of time: can it be for a moment believed that he, writing to fill out and clear up that tradition, would adopt *another* reckoning, to the confusion of his readers?

testimony to bear to the truth of the humanity of the Lord. This death of His, there were some who said, was no true death: only a semblance; only a withdrawal of the spirit from the body by a miracle; and He died not as men die. And so St. John at Ephesus looks back over the years that had passed, and in the power of the Spirit tells how the Jews, careful against outward pollution, besought Pilate that the legs of the three crucified men might be broken, and the bodies taken away: how, finding our Lord already dead, the soldier brake not His legs, but one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and the undeniable tokens of veritable human death were seen to issue therefrom. This the Apostle himself saw; and we may therefore assume that he had returned to the fatal spot, after having led away her who was now by a higher tie even than that of nature his mother, and had remained watching there since.

And in both these incidents, the Apostle reminds us, Holy Scripture found its fulfilment: in the former, the commandment concerning the Passover lamb, that not a bone of it was ever to be broken; in the latter, the declaration of Zechariah,

that the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem should look on Him whom they had pierced.

VIII. And here we have another point of junction of the four Evangelists: *the pious service of Joseph of Arimathea.*' The four notices are much in the same terms; those who do not state that Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, implying it; and St. John plainly describing him as a disciple, but secretly, for fear of the Jews. All, in the course of the narrative, inform us that it was the preparation of the Sabbath, as indeed we learnt before from St. John. St. Mark relates that Pilate wondered at Jesus being already dead, and assured himself that it was so by inquiry from the centurion. St. John adds that Nicodemus, who came before to Him by night, assisted in the pious labour of wrapping in linen the sacred Body; and by this we see the continual care of the beloved Apostle to introduce those circumstances which may illustrate the power of Jesus to educe faith and love. These two men, who before were secret and timid disciples, are made, by the wondrous power of the Cross, into bold and fearless men.

Their Master was popular, was widely followed, was gaining on the world,—then they feared to follow Him; now He is betrayed, forsaken, condemned, executed,—when lo! they come forward and bestow cost and care on His corpse.

The 'tomb cut in the rock,'—simply called such by St. Mark,—is described as Joseph's 'own new tomb' by St. Matthew; and both St. Luke and St. John add the significant notice, that never had any man been buried in it. The Three conclude with a notice respecting the faithful women who sat overagainst the sepulchre, and beheld it, and how His body was laid; and, adds St. Luke, ever precise when *they* are concerned, 'they went away and bought spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment.' We have but one notice of anything that occurred during the time when our Lord lay in the tomb, and that is found in St. Matthew. The chief priests and Pharisees obtained from Pilate leave to use the Roman guard, which was at their disposal during the feast, for the custody of the tomb, for fear the disciples should come and steal away the Body. Certainly, for some reason, this Evangelist seems to have had peculiar knowledge of

that which took place in the house of Pilate. It is just what we might expect, that according as each happened to have acquaintances who were concerned in this or that portion of the field of action, his narrative would embrace a set of details peculiar to himself.

IX. We now come to the most important, as it is the most difficult, part of our comparison: that of *the accounts of the Resurrection.* And here it is necessary to enter for a few moments again on the same train of thought which occupied us at the beginning of my last section. Let us again place ourselves on the spot, amidst the events which happened. The mood of mind of the whole body of disciples was that of bitter disappointment, gradually settling down into despair. They had passed out of their former confidence and hope. They 'trusted it had been He.' This had passed away, and they acknowledged their fatal mistake. There was doubtless something also of shame mingled with this sadness. They had 'erred, they had played the fool exceedingly.' They were going back to their homes and occupations sadder and wiser men. We have not the

faintest hint that hope survived in any one of them: that any one dwelt in thought upon the Lord's often repeated words, that after three days He would rise again. Certainly, it is plain that the beloved disciple did not: and if he did not, what other did? Certainly, it is as plain that the faithful women did not; for the very service which they came to render, implied finality of rest in the tomb; and when one of them found the Body gone, the fact of the Resurrection did not even occur to her; but simply that it had been taken away and laid elsewhere.

I make these remarks, as I made similar remarks before, to illustrate the character of this eventful day; and with the character, the narratives which partake of that character. It was unlike any other day that ever dawned. Many strange days have been, many new and unexpected turns have come suddenly upon men's lives: but never one like this. Think but of the event itself. The DEAD, ALIVE! not the lost and supposed to be dead. They had seen that body torn, pierced, buried. They had beheld it in its lifelessness taken down from the cross, livid and flaccid. They had even tended it in death, and wrapped it in spices for its

long rest in the tomb. Whatever doubt arose within them, none occurred to any mind respecting the reality of this fact of death. The DEAD, ALIVE! No mere apparition of the departed spirit, clothed in a thin veil of its former shape. The DEAD Himself, able to be tested and handled; with the marks of the nails in His hands and feet, and the pathway of the spear in His side. All was changed. Not to *them* only, as when the long-lost appears, and the widow's heart sings for joy; but all the world was changed, for the DEAD WAS ALIVE! Nature was changed. A new creation had begun. Human thought was changed. Death was no longer death, but the seed-ground and vestibule of life. The PAST was all changed: no longer a deplorable mistake, covering with shame, best forgotten,—but now a treasury of all that is precious, the childhood that is to be father of a glorious manhood. The PRESENT was all changed. The band of baffled ones, hiding their heads hither and thither in Jerusalem, suddenly knit up in heart and hope, with a mission such as man was never yet intrusted with, and a purpose such as man never yet conceived. Upon them that sat in darkness had arisen a great light. The FUTURE was all

changed ; if indeed the happy bewildered spirit had that day any leisure to look forward. The sinking of heart at those coming days of resumed humble occupation in Galilee :—that finger of scorn which was to point at the dupes who had been with Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified impostor :—where are these now? The Kingdom,—the Glory,—the Twelve Thrones,—all have flashed back again into the dark space. What wonder if the glory dazzled them—this morning sun in his strength bursting in upon midnight? What marvel if they 'could not see for the greatness of that light?'

And if the four narratives of the Resurrection be genuine pieces of human testimony, we have a right to claim that, as the day was, so shall the tidings be. All was surprise ; eager running to and fro ; reports waxing ever stronger and stronger ; idle tales become sober facts ; sober facts turned into shadows and fleeing like mist away. Where is all this, in those testimonies which are presented to me as truth? Do they reflect the character of the time? Are they fragmentary, hurried, confused — truth shivered in the shifting mirror? Because, if they are, I shall at least know one

thing: either they are the genuine evidence of those who were tossed upon the waves of this tempestuous day, or they are the ablest imitation the world has ever seen.

But suppose the contrary. Let us imagine matters to be thus: We have, I will say, in these four accounts, the most complete, nicely-fitted, soberly-balanced history of the whole events of the day. All is in its place. What one does not relate, the other puts in where it ought to come. No question arises, no doubt, no difficulty, as to what each person did and saw, and when. What would be our verdict on such a history? Thinking the *worst* of it—it is a story made up by collusion: these men met, and agreed what each should say; we have no security that the whole has not been invented and fixed together to deceive. Thinking the *best* of it, and believing it to relate the truth,—we lose the fourfold cord of testimony, and our manifold witnesses are reduced to one; or rather, not even to one, for we have no freshness of individual character left. We lose all the reflection of the stir and excitement of the day: such a Gospel would be a poor companion for Easter morning; it would have no retinacula to

lay hold of the interest. How many eyes would it cause to brim over with tears? How many hearts to leap with joy?

Which of these two characters belongs to our fourfold History of the Resurrection? I hope my next section will show.

VII.

THE FOUR NARRATIVES OF THE RESURRECTION.

IT is Easter morning: to me the best part of the best day in the year. The welcome return of soft breezes has dappled the trees in the old Deanery garden with bright spots of green; and against the clear blue sky the grey cathedral tower stands brightened by the unclouded sun. All is peace, except that the birds are plying round me their unceasing chorus, giving voice to the tranquillity, and making it deeper. Can there be a time when earth seems so like heaven—heaven so near to earth? And is this all a dream? Nay, is not heaven near to earth—is it not on earth? Sin is pardoned, death overcome and abolished, life eternally assured to the members of Christ. And all by that on which so many thoughts are fixed this day. In that Tomb on Calvary death

was for ever conquered; from that Tomb life for ever streamed forth, glorious and all-sufficient.

Let us see how this came to pass. Let us try, not artificially to weave the four accounts into one, but to ascertain and appreciate the leading features of each, and indicate at least the direction in which their agreement is to be looked for.

On the evening of the great Sacrifice, the faithful Joseph and the no longer timid Nicodemus brought about an hundred pound weight of myrrh and aloes, and wound round the Body with linen cloths, in which these precious spices were laid. This we are told by St. John, the Three noticing the winding it in the linen cloth, but not the bringing of the spices. St. Mark tells us that Joseph bought the linen cloth for the purpose. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (the mother of Joses) were sitting over against the tomb (Matthew), and saw where He was laid (Mark). And then St. Luke, who has ever most to tell of the doings of these holy women, adds, that they prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. Thus then we leave the tomb: the silence of death within, and a great stone rolled to the door to keep

all secure. We hear nothing of any visits made to it on the next day, the Sabbath, by the followers of Jesus. On that day, St. Matthew tells us, the chief priests and Pharisees applied to Pilate to have it made safe, and were commanded to use for that purpose the guard which was at their disposal during the feast. This they do, and add the precaution of *sealing* the stone; placing a cord across it, the two ends of which were sealed with wax to the jambs of the entrance. And thus the tomb is left this second night: the Roman guards walking their beat before it in the moonlight, or sitting employed in their talk or their pastimes at the entrance. So the night wears away, and the dawn approaches. It was yet dark, but not too dark to distinguish objects. So St. John expressly tells us; it was 'deep dawn,' writes St. Luke; it was 'becoming light towards the first day of the week,' writes St. Matthew. At that time, 'Mary Magdalene comes to the tomb,' writes St. John, taking one definite account from one eye-witness, and following it, without deviating to include the rest, or to add even the reason for her visit; 'came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to behold the tomb,' writes St. Matthew: St. Luke going

on with his former sentence, which was said of 'the women which had followed with Him from Galilee.' He adds that 'they brought with them the spices which they had prepared,' thus indicating the purpose of their visit. The reader will remember that the words here found in our authorized version, 'and some others with them,' are not in our most ancient MSS., and must be excluded. They were probably added as an attempt towards harmonizing.

But here we are met by the independent and apparently to us hardly reconcilable account of St. Mark. 'When the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary [the mother] of Joses and Salome, brought spices that they might come and anoint Him.' That is, they brought the spices after sunset on the Saturday evening, when, according to Jewish ideas, the Sabbath was over. This seems at first sight at variance with St. Luke, who places the preparing the spices and ointments before the notice that they rested the Sabbath day. But his sentence hardly necessitates such precision of sequence. The former words of it, 'they returned and prepared spices and ointments,' may be intended for a general account of

what they did in the interim, and the following notice, which stands literally, 'and the Sabbath indeed they rested according to the commandment,' may be parenthetical, merely indicating that they did not employ the sacred hours in this preparation. The difference here is too trifling to be matter of serious notice. But as much cannot be said of the next words in St. Mark, that they came very early on the first day of the week to the Tomb, '*after the sun had risen*,' for thus, and thus only, can the words be rendered; the English translation, 'at the rising of the sun,' being an unfaithful and discreditable one. Now it is not my purpose to force these accounts into harmony; but I cannot help saying that in this particular case I have long suspected that there must be some error in our present reading of St. Mark's text. Conjecture is and must be always excluded from the *criticism* of the Sacred Word; and no text ought ever to be altered conjecturally. Still it is not in human nature not to have suspicions, however imperative may be the duty of checking them, and keeping the text as we find it. It would be hardly likely that St. Mark should have written here, 'very early . . . when the sun had risen;' for the

time of the sun's rising in that country was not ordinarily accounted 'very early.' By that time in the morning all was life and stir. What if St. Mark wrote one word (*ouketi*) more than we now read in his text, and signified, 'when the sun had not yet risen?' But this cannot now be set at rest, and faith must be content to accept the discrepancy, not to bridge it over by the clumsy resource of multiplying visits and producing all sorts of unlikely coincidences.

And even St. Mark's account (not St. Luke's in the genuine text) tells us that they questioned with themselves, 'Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb?' and St. John relates that Mary 'seeth the stone taken away from the tomb:' St. Luke says the same of his band of unnamed women: St. Mark the same of the two Marys and Salome, and adds as a reason for their question, 'for it was very large.'

Here it is evident that we must give to St. Matthew's fuller and independent account a separate consideration. In the dawn, the two Marys came to look at the tomb. 'And behold there was a great earthquake: for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and

rolled away the stone and sat upon it. And his appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for fear of him the keepers shook, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said to the women, Fear not ye,' etc. Now the obvious impression given by this continuous narrative is, that the women witnessed the earthquake and the descent of the angel. It is not absolutely said so, nor is the narrative committed to the fact. But we may venture to assert, that such must certainly have been the impression of the Writer, or he could hardly have written as he did.

But this is a case where, upon consulting the other accounts, the matter assumes a different aspect. It would seem, from their united testimony, that these startling incidents were *not* witnessed by the women. They at once, finding the stone rolled away, entered (see, however, below) into the tomb, and not finding the Body, they there saw the angel (Matthew, Mark), or angels (Luke), who reassured them. St. John gives us a further detail: that Mary Magdalene *did not* enter the tomb, but on seeing the stone removed, at once inferred that the Lord's Body

had been taken away, and ran to tell Simon Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved.

So that here we have the band of women severed into two, Mary Magdalene, and those who were left. In St. Luke's narrative this is not recognised, for he tells that 'it was Mary Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary [the mother] of James, and the rest with them, who told the apostles these things.' Still, as will be observed throughout the greater part of the history, details which could not have been inferred from the different accounts, are not precluded by them. St. Luke says nothing inconsistent with the women having come in detachments, though apparently his information did not specify this.

Now as to the words of the angel or angels in the Three Gospels. In substance they are the same, 'Seek not the living among the dead,—He is not here, He is risen, as He said.' These last words (of St. Matthew) are omitted by St. Mark, and in St. Luke are given at greater length, to the omission of the command, 'tell the disciples to go into Galilee,' which is contained in the two others, and of the invitation to come and see the place where He lay. St. Mark, as might have

been expected, preserves the fact, that not only were the disciples mentioned as the objects of this message, but *Peter* was besides specified by name. We may observe, as a slight indication where to look for the greater precision as between two of the accounts, that the concluding words, 'as He told you,' in St. Mark, have become 'behold, I have told you' in St. Matthew.

But now we come to some of the remarkable indications of that character of the whole history which I have contended it will be found to bear, if it indeed contain the genuine testimonies of persons affected as this day must have affected those concerned. And I would have the reader notice, that the chief form which this character takes in the Three Evangelists is, that of relating a portion of the dispersed action under an apparent impression that it was the whole. Each of the Three had his own sources of authentic information, and to these he confines himself, not excluding, but appearing to ignore, what happened elsewhere, by giving this special testimony as if it included all. With St. John this is not so. He *expressly* takes one portion of the evidence, and pursues it minutely, and exhaustingly. He

tells us what was witnessed by himself, and by one person who herself related her account to him.

Even to this general remark there are exceptions. One case has occurred already, where the accounts, as they now stand, are beyond *our* power to put together: and other cases will soon come before us. To this I say, and I want faithful Christians generally to say, What wonder? Is not this discrepancy, in such a case, a far weightier and deeper token of truth, than would be the strictest verbal agreement?

Let us proceed. After the angelic message, St. Mark adds, 'And they went out and fled from the tomb: and trembling and excitement [ecstasy] possessed them, and they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid.' Compare this with St. Luke: 'And returning from the tomb they brought all these tidings to the eleven and all the rest;' and St. Matthew: 'And departing quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, they ran to tell these tidings to His disciples.' Of course, at first sight, records can hardly be more expressly opposed. It is quite impossible that the same persons can be the subjects of both these accounts. But here comes in an important par-

ticular. The Gospel of St. Mark, as has been seen in a previous section, breaks off abruptly with these words, 'for they were afraid.' What we now learn, is apparently not all which that Evangelist originally narrated. What exception to this general assertion, that they said nothing to any one, might have been coming, one cannot tell. The narrative might have proceeded to record how their fear and excitement were affected by the appearance and command of the Lord Himself; or might have given some other notice which would show us that this particular party of women took a line of their own, and were, as we may strongly suspect, a second off-set from the main body. Here, as in all other cases, sound criticism, the terror of the morbid and half-informed, comes in aid of the Faith, and confirms the veracity from which it is at first sight supposed to detract.

But if at this point we lose one precious historian, we gain another. The Gospel of St. Mark is completed by an Apostolic fragment (ch. xvi. 9-20), containing an independent summary of the events of the Resurrection and Ascension. As we proceed we shall take this

for our fourth account, designating it as that of 'The Summarist.'

And now let us pursue our narrative. Three separate objects claim our attention. First, Mary Magdalene, who upon seeing the stone removed, immediately ran to Simon Peter and the beloved disciple; secondly, a portion of the women who ran (Matthew, Luke) to tell the disciples; thirdly, another portion (?) of the women who fled from the tomb in fear, saying nothing to any one.

And here again the skein becomes too intricate for our hands to unravel; for while St. Matthew seems to relate that, as the women were going to tell the disciples, Jesus Himself met them, not only are we expressly told by the Summarist that the *first* appearance was *to Mary Magdalene*, but the message of the women to the disciples, as reported by the two on the road to Emmaus, bears no trace of their having seen the Lord Himself: 'they had seen a vision of angels, which said that He was alive;' which certainly could not have been the report, had they seen Himself. Here again, it is true, sound criticism comes somewhat to our help, but still leaves us in considerable difficulty. The words, '*as they went to tell his dis-*

ciples,' found in the common text of Matt. xxviii. 9, are wanting in our most ancient MSS., and should be expunged. But even thus we cannot get rid of the impression that the spirit of the narrative requires us to understand that it *was so*. We shall see, as we proceed, how difficult it is to explain this.

Let us now for a while follow Mary Magdalene in St. John's narrative. She runs, and comes to Peter and John, with her news that the Lord had been taken away out of the sepulchre. At once, the two disciples run to the tomb together. Here, as far as regards Peter, St. Luke's narrative agrees, but places his running to the tomb as the consequence of the report by all the women of what had been said by the angel.

As Peter and John ran to the tomb, Mary followed. This is of necessity implied by St. John, who tells us that when they left it, Mary remained behind weeping. Looking into the tomb, she saw the two angels sitting, one at the Head, the other at the Feet, where the Body had lain. On their asking her the cause of her tears, she turns round,—struck, as Chrysostom finely says, by a sudden change of expression on the countenance

of the angels,—and sees the Lord Himself. Being commanded by Him, she goes and tells 'the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that He had said these things to her.' All this is continuous in one and the same narrative (St. John): and it is not we, but he, that has divided expressly her *first* tidings, to Peter and John, from her *second*, to the disciples.

Here the Summarist comes in with full confirmation, and an additional particular: 'Having arisen on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene. . . . She went and told them who had been with Him, *as they mourned and wept.* And they hearing that He had been seen by her, disbelieved.'

Now let us go to St. Luke for an additional note of time. The two travellers to Emmaus, before they left Jerusalem, had heard the message brought by the band of women (as above) concerning the vision of angels; they also knew of the visit of Peter and John: but they had heard *no tidings of Jesus himself having been seen:* 'Some of those who came with us also went to the tomb, and found it as the women had said, *but Him they saw not.*' These two, therefore, we

may infer, had left Jerusalem before Mary arrived with her tidings of a personal appearance. It is true the whole body of disciples may not have been assembled in one and the same place; but on comparing the narratives, it would appear that they were at least in close and rapid communication all the day: and certainly their being found assembled in the evening with the doors shut for fear of the Jews, and being thus at once found in a defined spot by the travellers from Emmaus, looks as if the main body at least had been there for some time before.

Let us then see,—if we may assume that they left before Mary Magdalene's second tidings,—what this will import respecting the time of those tidings being brought. Emmaus was sixty stadia, or furlongs, from Jerusalem—*i.e.*, above seven English miles: a walk for ordinary men, supposing them to be at their leisure, of about two hours and a half. Even allowing for delay while the conversation was proceeding, we cannot set down more than three hours for the journey. On their arrival at Emmaus, they say, 'It is towards evening, and the day hath now declined.' It is probable that the sun was not set, but 'westering,'

approaching the horizon. It could hardly have been earlier than five o'clock, it was more probably half-past five. Thus we should get *half-past two*, or at the earliest *two*, for the time of their leaving Jerusalem. But we have seen that they left before any personal appearance of the Lord had been announced. We shall thus have, even supposing these two not to have come straight from the city, but to have tarried somewhere by the way, still a considerable number of hours left, after the early morning, before either Mary Magdalene or the other women had announced any personal appearance. This inference as to the time does not, it is true, do much *positive* service in helping us over our difficulty; but it furnishes a useful negative indication—viz., that we must not too hastily assume all that has as yet been related to have occupied only the early morning of the Resurrection-day. By some means or other, the time from sunrise till midday, or past, had elapsed, before any tidings of Jesus having been seen had become current among the disciples. And put together with this, that, as matter of fact, there were appearances on this day which are not related to us. That to Peter is only briefly indi-

cated; that to James, the Lord's brother, is traditionally placed on this day, although St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xv., seems to mark that it followed the appearance to 'more than five hundred brethren at once.'

The tendency of these considerations is to lead us to suspend our judgment as to the identity, or inconsistency, of one Evangelist's detail with that of another. There was ample time for many visits to the tomb before it became known by all that visits to the tomb were profitless. And mere suspicion, on the difficulty arising at Matt. xxviii. 9, that the Evangelist, in summing up the incidents, must be speaking of another band of women from that previously in his view, thus becomes, at all events, legitimized by the ascertained conditions of the earlier narrative.

And now we come to another difficulty, arising from the declaration of the Summarist, in Mark xvi. 13, that the associated disciples *did not believe* the travellers returned from Emmaus. For we know, from the precise and detailed account in St. Luke, that on the contrary, 'they found the Eleven and those with them assembled, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to

Simon.' Of this I cannot see, and therefore do not pretend to offer, any solution. It must be confessed that the tendency of its occurrence is rather to diminish the authority, while at the same time it completely establishes the independence, of the Summarist's account. Had he been, as some have supposed, merely a filler-up of the gap at the end of St. Mark out of the other Gospels, this startling discrepancy would never have been found.

And now we come to the first appearance of the Lord to the assembled disciples. While the travellers from Emmaus were yet telling their wonderful story, and mutual confirmations and congratulations were being exchanged, Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them. This appearance is related at length by St. Luke and St. John, and briefly touched by the Summarist. That all Three relate one and the same appearance, is made manifest by two or three instances of independent coincidence. St. John tells us that the Lord repeated twice the simple greeting, 'Peace be to you:' while St. Luke shows us what reason there was for it, in the disciples being terrified and affrighted, supposing that they had seen a spirit.

St. John tells us that He showed them His hands and His side. St. Luke again explains in detail, by giving His own words as He did so, 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself,' what the reader supplied in his own mind in St. John's account, that this exhibition of Himself was in reply to doubts which arose in their hearts. St. John tells us, '*Then were the disciples glad* when they saw the Lord;' St. Luke, that they *yet believed not for their gladness;* and adds the remarkable detail, that He asked for food, and did eat before them. This last particular again is confirmed by the Summarist, who tells us that it was 'as the Eleven sat at meat' that the Lord appeared to them. St. Luke proceeds to relate how He went on to discourse to them of the prophecies respecting Himself, and His own previous words while He was with them. The Summarist writes, that 'He reproached them with unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them that had seen Him.' It will be observed, that this, while no doubt it represents the discourse in St. Luke, has taken its form from the previous assertion of this same writer, that the travellers from Emmaus were not believed.

St. John has the important addition of the breathing the Holy Spirit on the disciples, and the apostolic mission ; of which we may also discern traces in the 48th and 49th verses of the narrative in St. Luke.

St. John also gives us the deeply interesting account of the unbelief of St. Thomas, which brings in the mention of yet another appearance of the Lord a week after, under exactly similar circumstances, for the confirmation of the doubter's faith.

And now, as we hurry rapidly on to the glorious end, the independence, and, indeed, apparent divergence of the Four become more striking than ever.

St. Matthew and St. Mark, in relating the events at the tomb, have reported the command of the angel, that the disciples should go away into Galilee, where they should see the Lord. St. Matthew repeats this command as having been given again by the Lord Himself, when He appeared to the women ; and again refers to its having been given yet more in detail, relating how the Eleven went to Galilee to *the mountain where Jesus had appointed them.* St. John, confining himself at first to the

personal narrative of Mary Magdalene, naturally has nothing of this command; but with reference to what happened in Galilee, he gives us the touching and important history contained in his twenty-first chapter.

Now it is very remarkable, as one of the most convincing proofs of the independence on one another of the three Evangelists, that St. Luke, in all probability gathering his materials *in Jerusalem*, makes no mention of, nor has the slightest allusion to, this Galilean journey of the disciples. The word 'Galilee' occurs indeed in the speech of the angel to the women at the tomb, but it is quite in another reference—'remember, that *when He was yet with you in Galilee*, he spoke to you,' etc. And had we St. Luke's narrative in his Gospel alone, or St. Luke's and that of the Summarist, we should certainly infer that the Ascension took place immediately after the discourse of the Lord, at His appearance to the Eleven, on that first day of the week.

But gathering the particulars of the Galilean journey from St. Matthew and St. John, we find that the Eleven (and others?) went thither to a particular mountain, appointed by Christ Himself;

and that there He appeared to them, and gave them the great commission to evangelize the world, and the promise of His continued presence with them. It has been generally assumed, that this is the appearance spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 6, 'After this He was seen by above five hundred brethren at once.' No doubt it *may* have been so; but on the other hand it must be borne in mind, that the incident in St. Matthew is simply said to have happened to *the eleven disciples.* It is equally possible, that there may have been another appearance to the greater number. Another appearance to a portion of the Eleven we know there was, from the Gospel of St. John, who has appended his supplementary twenty-first chapter for the purpose of clearing up a wrong impression, which was prevalent owing to some words of our Lord on that occasion. The verse with which he concludes this supplementary chapter is important for our present purpose. He tells us, as he also did at the end of chap. xx., that there were many other things which Jesus did,—so many that, according to his simple hyperbole, if they should all be written, 'the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.' We are not then

to expect that independent selections out of so rich a store will be in every respect coincident, or that all such taken together are exhaustive. There were more incidents, more appearances, more remarkable sayings, than we are told of. The slight hint of St. Paul need not be found to fit on to the detailed account of St. Matthew. Nor need we put together the complete speech of our Lord in St. Luke, with the complete speech in the Summarist, and by supposing them to have been necessarily spoken at the same time, produce incoherence and confusion. We have only, so to speak, fragments of single groups, out of the action of an immense and crowded picture. It is not for us, because the positions of one or two figures in separate fragments may seem to agree, to rush to the conclusion that they necessarily formed part of the same, and by 'harmonizing,' to bring about incongruous piecing. The only result of this too common procedure will be, as it has ever been, to give an air of unreality and constraint to the compound figures thus grafted on one another, to blunt the vividness, and destroy the simplicity, of the truthful and independent narratives.

For all further particulars up to the time of the

Ascension, we are indebted to St. Luke. In his Gospel, he had given an account of that great event, precise as to its manner and place, although without any exact note of time. This is amply supplied in his 'second treatise,' written, we may believe, from the character given by himself of his researches in the preface to his Gospel, after additional materials of evidence had been collected. There we learn that *forty days* intervened between the Resurrection and the Ascension. The disciples, whom we find in John xxi. employed about their former occupations in Galilee, seem to have returned to Jerusalem before the approach of the Feast of Pentecost. St. Luke tells us, that the Lord was 'being seen of them throughout these forty days.' So that we need be at no loss to account for their movements; they may be assumed to have been under the especial guidance of their Divine Master Himself. Being arrived in Jerusalem, they are commanded by Him not to depart thence, but 'there to wait for the promise of the Father, which they had heard of Him.' It would seem, from the way in which the forty days are specified, and the notice, 'being assembled together with them,' inserted before this speech of

our Lord,—as if this second narrative were specially designed to correct the impression, undoubtedly conveyed by the *first*, that the command, and the Ascension, followed continuously on the appearance to which they are there appended. A further indication of the same kind has been believed to exist in Acts i. 12, where the former notice, that 'He led them out *as far as to Bethany*,' is made more precise by the statement, that the spot where He ascended was the *Mount of Olives;* and it is added, that it was 'nigh to Jerusalem, *a Sabbath-day's journey*.' It was long ago believed that these last words were occasioned by offence having been taken at the leading out '*as far as to Bethany*,' the Ascension having taken place *on the Sabbath-day*. The two accounts are not really inconsistent, Bethany being on the further slope of the Mount of Olives, and the portion of the Mount adjoining bearing, as commonly, the name of the district or parish in which it was situated.

The Summarist gathers up the events of this period in very few words: and those few are calculated, if taken alone, even more than those of St. Luke, to give the impression that the Ascen-

sion happened at the end of the words which the Lord spoke on His appearance to the Eleven there related. But the subsequent and concluding verse, which sums up the labours of the Apostles in preaching the Word, and the signs following, shows us that we must not look for precision where the expressions are so general.

We have now only to deal with the fact of the omission of all narrative of the Ascension in the two apostolic Evangelists.

In St. John, we have two distinct *mentions* of the Ascension: one in ch. vi. 62, the other in our Lord's own announcement of it to Mary Magdalene after His Resurrection. It may be asked, why he should have omitted to give an account of the event itself? But it may be replied, that we are not to judge of the completeness of the Gospel of St. John by mere insertions or omissions of this kind. Completeness, with him, is in *doctrine*, rather than in narration. The Ascension had been predicted in connexion with the doctrine of the Lord's Body, and had been announced as His intention after His Resurrection; and this having been done, St. John's purpose has been accomplished. Not a complete narration, but a

complete image of the Incarnate Son of God, was that at which his Gospel aimed.

With St. Matthew the case was different; and the total omission of the Ascension occasions us surprise. The mind is obliged to satisfy itself by observing, that there is a propriety in terminating that Gospel which above all others sets forth the kingly character of our Lord, by the declaration that *all power was given unto Him in heaven and earth*, and the commission *to teach all nations*, which follows in the exercise of that power.

After all, let it be remembered that the Ascension of our Blessed Lord into heaven was no new event in the course of Redemption, but was in fact only the completion of His Resurrection, involved in it, and effected by the same act of power. The interval which separated the two was not a necessity for our Lord, but was interposed in condescension to us, to furnish His Church with full and indubitable evidence of His being alive from the dead. His Resurrection being related, the Ascension, though not related, follows as a matter of course. The imputation, that an Evangelist who relates not the Ascension knew not of it, is too foolish even for ordinary unbelief to conde-

scend to. That one who like St. Matthew had described our Lord as saying, 'Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven,' should not have known of the Ascension, would be simply impossible, even had we no account of his having been an eye-witness of the event itself.

We have thus endeavoured to furnish a few hints to the English reader for the comparison and understanding of the Gospels, regarded as Four independent testimonies to the Life, Death, and Resurrection of our blessed Lord. It has been our endeavour to apply to the subject the resources of sound criticism, and to adhere in its treatment most strictly to simplicity and honesty of thought. We are persuaded, as we have expressed elsewhere, that 'Christianity never was, and never can be the gainer, by any concealment, warping, or avoidance of the plain truth, wherever it is to be found :'[1] and we may add, neither will it gain by the suppression or concealment of any existing difficulty, nor by the offering of any specious but insufficient solution.

[1] *Greek Testament*, vol. i., Prolegomena, i. iv. 3.

In commenting on the Holy Scriptures, we must be TRUE MEN, *dealing faithfully and boldly with existing facts.* The more we do this, the clearer will become the evidence for our holy faith, and the more God Himself will be glorified.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

I.

JERUSALEM.

FIRST, what is this book which we have taken in hand? Its writer speaks of a 'former treatise,' thereby making this his second, or latter treatise. He addresses a certain Theophilus, a circumstance which can leave us in no doubt as to his own personal identity. He is evidently St. Luke, the writer of the third Gospel, which opens with a dedication to the same person. So far is clear.

But now, on referring to the opening of that third Gospel, I find a remarkable and elaborate preface, setting forth the reasons and nature of the work which was to follow. Judging by analogy, something of the kind might here also have been looked for. But at first sight we do not seem to find it. The narrative appears at

once to begin with the account of our Lord's Ascension.

It is possible, however, that we may be mistaken, and that the prefatory announcement of which we were in search may be present after all. Let us examine somewhat closely into the matter of this opening portion of the Acts, and see whether we can discover its purport and use.

First, let us observe how the writer designates his former treatise. It is said to be *concerning all things that Jesus* BEGAN *both to do and to teach.* Now, from the arrangement of these words in the original Greek, two things are plain which escape the English reader: First, there is an emphasis on the verb, '*began*;' secondly, there is none on the word '*Jesus*.' The contrast is not that the former treatise related what *Jesus* began, and this relates what some other person or persons continued; but it is that the former treatise related what Jesus *began* to do and to teach; and this relates what He, the same Jesus, *continued* to do and to teach. And thus we have won already a position of some importance for the understanding of what is to follow. It is to be a continuation or second part of the acts and teachings of the Lord, as that former

treatise was a beginning or first part. So that it has rather unfortunately been called '*the Acts of the Apostles*,' being rather, 'the Second Part of the Gospel,' or 'the latter' or 'second treatise of St. Luke.'

Now let us pause to exemplify the idea thus won for us, that our Lord is the actor throughout this book. It is remarkable how the contents of the book justify it. It is He who (i. 24) is supplicated to designate the new Apostle; HE, who, being by the right hand of God exalted, shed forth that which was seen and heard on the day of Pentecost (ii. 33); HIS name, through faith in His name, that made the lame man strong (iii. 16, iv. 10); HE, to whom, in the increase of the Church, believers were added (v. 14); HE, to whom the Apostles gave witness, as exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour (v. 31, 32) and whom they ceased not to teach and preach (v. 42); HE, who was seen standing at the right hand of God to succour His dying proto-martyr (vii. 56); HE, that was preached everywhere by those whom the persecution that arose about Stephen had scattered (viii. 4, 5, 35); HE, who by His own personal act wrought the conversion of the chief persecutor

(ix. 3, 5); HE, of whom Peter said, 'Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole' (ix. 34); HE, who is recognised as 'Lord of all,' by the same St. Peter, when speaking in the house of Cornelius, of the dispensation which opened the door of faith to the Gentiles (x. 36); and finally, as regards the first portion of our book, HE, by whose name the disciples were collectively called on the founding of the church at Antioch (xi. 26); not forgetting that which perhaps, after all, rather than insulated instances, is the true and great example of that which we are illustrating; that it is His Spirit, the promise of the Father sent by HIM, who is poured out on His Church, and in whose power every act is done and every word spoken.

This point then being established, we recur again to the opening of the book. The former treatise, dealing with the beginning of the acts and teachings of Jesus, had its limit in the Ascension: 'until the day in which he was taken up.' From that day then our present history begins.

But here we are met by something unexpected. At this point we look for a preface, like that which opens the Gospel, informing us of the purpose and nature of this second treatise. But instead of that,

we are carried back at once over the limit of the history of the former treatise, and find ourselves reading a second narrative of the Ascension. But this, which is at first sight strange, is easily accounted for. The time of our Lord appearing to the disciples after the Resurrection is distinctly marked off from the time when He was with them in the flesh. Speaking to them after the Resurrection, He refers back to that former period as 'when I was yet with you.' He had ceased to be with them as He was with them before. He was seen, not as man by man, but only at intervals and in vision : 'appearing to them,' and vanishing from their sight. And this period of the forty days was full of the future. During it, His discourses were concerning the Kingdom of God, that is, the Church of the future,—her constitution and her fortunes. During it were uttered by Him those commandments by which their future course was to be guided. So that this period contained the germ of all that our present treatise is to unfold. The things that Jesus continued to do and teach here found their announcement, as far as He was pleased to give it.

And we here find, as has well been ob-

served,[1] a reason for the difference in the manner of treating the period preceding the Ascension here and in the Gospel. There it is all gathered up very summarily; indeed so briefly, that, as I have observed in a previous section, it may seem as if it had been overlooked altogether. It belonged not to the design of the Gospel to set it forth in all its significance. Having regard to a future course of action, it is reserved till that future course of action comes to be related. Here it is strictly in its place, and every word of its history is important. Let us see then what it includes.

First, notice the preparation in this narrative for a book which is to deal with the outpouring and dispensation of the Holy Spirit. The writer seems studiously to introduce the mention of the Holy Ghost as ruling alike, and connecting together, the ministry of our Lord and that of His Apostles. It was (ver. 2) 'through the Holy Ghost' that he delivered to them commandments respecting their future course: in a few days they were to be 'baptized with the Holy Ghost:'

[1] By Baumgarten, in p. 11 of his *Apostelgeschichte;* a treatise to which it is a real pleasure again to acknowledge my obligations. It has been published for the English reader in Clark's 'Theological Library.'

they were to 'receive power, after that the Holy Ghost was come upon them.'

Next observe the command, not to depart from Jerusalem. This injunction is also related at the end of 'the former treatise' (Luke xxiv. 49): but in the summary character of that abridgment of the events following the Resurrection, it loses its proper significance. In the absence of all allusion in the Gospel to the disciples' journey into Galilee, the command would there appear as if it precluded such a journey. Here, we know that the journey had already taken place, and the return from it; this latter also under the direction of the Lord Himself. This regard paid to Jerusalem is very remarkable. He who came not to destroy the law and the prophets but to fulfil them, will have His Gospel in its first going forth, bound to the Holy City, and to its solemn appointed observances. 'To the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.' And this is the more to be observed, because of the declaration so soon following, that the Gospel was not to remain in Jerusalem, but to be spread to the ends of the earth. That which is to supersede the Jewish polity, that which is to contradict its maxims and

its spirit, is yet in its beginnings not to be separated from it. Jerusalem is to be the mother of us all: Old and New Testament are to be inseparably linked in one.

And this is further apparent, when we notice in what words the Lord characterizes the great outpouring of the Spirit for which the Church was to wait in Jerusalem. It is 'the promise of the Father:' not *His own* promise, though He announces it in words belonging rather to the spirit of His own preaching than to that of the Prophets: not John's promise, though in saying 'ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost,' He cites the very terms in which the Baptist had announced the working of the Greater One who was to come after him. It is 'the promise of *the Father*,' because it is the one sum and substance of all the Old Testament promises, in that dispensation which was especially declaratory of the Father's purpose and will: it is '*the* promise of the Father,' as embracing in one all other promises, and as the inclusive blessing of the covenant being no less than the entire renewal of man by the indwelling Spirit: a blessing unknown to the earlier dispensation, and by virtue of which

the least under the latter covenant is greater than the greatest under the former one. This baptism by the Holy Ghost was to be the fulfilment of that which the baptism of John only foreshadowed.

And now, why 'not many days hence?' Why was this, and no other, especially the time for this indwelling of the Holy Ghost in our nature to begin? St. John furnishes us with the answer, when he tells us (vii. 39), 'the Holy Ghost was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified.' On Him, the inclusive Head of our humanity, the Holy Spirit alighted in His baptism. To Him the Spirit was given without measure. But the fulness of the outpouring of this Spirit from Him over all flesh summed up in Him, awaited the full acceptance of all our flesh in Him, when He had by himself purged our sins and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High. It is this which so closely binds on the narrative of the Ascension to all that is to follow. It is this which makes the 'not many days hence' so pregnant with deep meaning, as assigning to the greatest event in the Church's history its proper and only place.

And now comes the question of the disciples

respecting the restoring at this time of the kingdom to Israel. Did it arise from understanding, or from misunderstanding, of our Lord's words? Jointly from both. From the former, in that they connected together the baptism by the Spirit and the (true) restoration of the glory of Israel: from the latter, in that they supposed this to be that literal restoration of outward pre-eminence, which indisputably was the subject of Old Testament promise, and had been declared by our Lord Himself.

Notice how the reply to this their question leads on to what is to follow. Our Lord does not, as sometimes supposed, repudiate the assumption that the kingdom was to be restored to Israel: nay rather He Himself assumes it, but, in strict consistency with His own declaration in Mark xiii. 32, warns them, that the times and the seasons are not for us to know, but are by the Father reserved in His own authority. This being so, speculate not on them, but learn the announcement of the part which is to be your own, when power from on high has come upon you. This will be the true founding of that Kingdom of which you ask, in which, at the

Father's own time, Israel shall be restored to pre-eminence. 'Ye shall receive power.' Then at present they were weak; and it was a sign of their weakness, that they had asked this question. When power was come upon them, they should no longer ask about the kingdom, but work it out, in their new and energetic testimony to Him who is its King and Founder. And the fountain of this power was to be the Holy Ghost. Not till He had come upon them, were they to be thus endowed. Not till He had become the inheritance of the ends of the earth by the gradual spread of the evangelic testimony to Jesus, could this kingdom fully come.

And now we have come to the sentence which, above all others in this prefatory narrative, sums up the purpose and contents of the book which is to follow. 'Ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' In these words, we have in fact a brief table of contents of the whole book. The testimony in Jerusalem occupies the history as far as the end of ch. vii.; in ch. viii. it spreads to all Judea and Samaria: in ch. ix., we have the preparation, by the conversion

of the Apostle of the Gentiles, for its being carried abroad over all the world: and the rest of the book is occupied with this extension. In ch. xi. we pass from Jerusalem to Antioch; thence over Asia Minor, and into Greece: thence, finally, to the world's great capital, Rome.

And now follows the account of the Ascension, fully given in detail. We may be disposed to inquire, Why so? For clearly this writer cannot be supposed at the solemn opening of His book to place any narrative so circumstantially related without special purpose. It is not *merely* because, since writing his Gospel, he has made new and careful researches, and is able to fill in details which he possessed not then. Those who have thought about the matter, have seen very sufficient reasons why the Ascension should be here so fully narrated. First, the *manner* of the Lord's reception into heaven is important for all that is to follow. It is not sudden nor forcible, but tranquil, and as matter of course. No chariot of fire and horses of fire, as when Elijah was taken; no mysterious disappearance, as when Enoch 'was not, for God took him:' but simply a journey, as of a man to his home. 'They looked as He went up.'

And inasmuch as a cloud received Him out of their sight, it was declared to them that the human form of the Lord which thus departed from among them, has not disappeared into the air, but has entered heaven, the abode of God, and is there working and acting. But how? Entering heaven as the glorified King, it is concerning His Kingdom that He is acting and working; but inasmuch as He is withdrawn from them, and no longer personally among them, it is not outwardly and visibly that He is thus working; not concerning a visible earthly Kingdom: but only by that outpouring of the Spirit which He is gone up to receive, and concerning an inward and spiritual kingdom.

And how notably is accomplished that saying of His, the fulfilment of which *began* indeed with the moment when He uttered it, 'Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man' (John i. 51). Now first the gulf between heaven and earth is bridged over; and, accordingly, two heavenly messengers, as men among men, stand by the Apostles as they gazed after their departing Lord, and spoke of the far distance in time, when

the Lord should be no longer hidden, the kingdom no longer working in the depths of men's spirits, but this same Jesus, unchanged, in all His humanity, even as He had gone from them, should come again.

Thus we have the mind and position of the writer fully set before us: and without a careful examination of the prefatory narrative, it is impossible rightly to apprehend it. The Lord, received into heaven till the time of the restitution of all things; by the appointment of the Father and by the agency of the Spirit, working all in all; the Apostles, left on earth to carry out His commands and witness to Him in all the world; the promise of the Spirit about to be fulfilled not many days hence: this is the *situation* with which the book opens. And the reader needs to be reminded, that this view of the position and those agents are kept in view throughout. For this has been very generally forgotten. The unfortunate name of the book, 'the Acts of the Apostles,' has arisen from this forgetfulness: and it has also resulted in a number of theories, each more absurd and irrelevant than the last, concerning the composition and purpose of the history. Being persuaded that the

key, and the only key to it, is in the view above propounded, I shall not trouble the reader with an account of any of those theories, but shall at once proceed to an endeavour to unfold the contents of the book according to this scheme.

And what have we next related to us? Manifestly, as we have already seen, the great History of the Church is to *open* with its constitution by the outpouring of the Spirit. So that in this second part of ch. i. the commencement of the history is not yet reached: we are still amidst prefatory matter. Let us examine its character and appropriateness. The Apostles return from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem, full of joy, full of dependence on their glorified Head, worshipping Him, and frequenting their own assembly and the Temple. 'Their very souls were prayer.'[1] They were in an especial manner under His guidance. The Comforter had not yet come; and we cannot suppose that they were left orphans, but were rather specially cared for in the interval.

Under this guidance, Peter is moved to address the 120 brethren on the incompleteness of the Apostolic band. For the Church, constituted on

[1] Baumgarten.

the model of Israel, this Apostolic band was of the weightiest import. Its members were above all others to be witnesses of the Lord's Resurrection. Its members were to lead and govern the first age of the Church: and, in its ultimate glories, were to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of the Israel of God. One of the former number had despised his heavenly inheritance for an earthly one: had 'gone to his own place,' which he had purchased with the wages of his iniquity, and had there (perhaps, as some believe, in the very valley of the typical Hinnom, thus throwing light on the mysterious phrase just cited) met with his fearful end. Into his place another must be chosen. This choice is made in accordance with the prophetic announcements of Scripture, and with regard to the necessary qualifications of an Apostle. It is made by the whole assembled body, under the direction of him who, in virtue of his confession of faith in the Son of God, had been constituted, during this building up of the Church, leader and president of the band. According to his designation, two are selected possessing the necessary requirements. Whether there were only these two thus endowed, or whether these were

chosen out of more, is, I conceive, of very little importance. The narrative (ver. 23) certainly seems to imply the latter alternative: and it would be natural perhaps that the function of the Church should not be confined merely to describing the obvious requisites for an Apostle, as would be the case under the other. The ultimate choice is left to the Lord Himself. And the words in which the assembly prays, show us that the reference is made in all recognition of the Godhead and absolute foreknowledge of the ascended Saviour. It is not said 'Show whom thou *wilt choose*,' but 'whom Thou hast chosen.' There exists no more decisive proof of the absolute recognition of the Divinity of our blessed Lord, than this first prayer of His Church. That the prayer is made to Him, is undeniable. The very word in which He says, John vi. 70, 'Have I not *chosen* you twelve?' is also used here: if He chose the Twelve, His it was to choose the new Apostle. And, the prayer being thus made to Him, there is in it attributed to Him knowledge of the hearts of all men, and that divine foreknowledge which, before all secondary agents, determines the destiny of men.

I have dwelt thus at length on the prefatory

matter, because it was needful that it should be laid out somewhat in detail before the reader. We must henceforward pass on more rapidly, bringing out only the more prominent points, and their places in the history.

The time of the fulfilment of the fiftieth day from the Passover was noted by the solemn feast of Pentecost. As described to us in the Old Testament, that feast had reference only to the completion of the ingathering of the harvest. The circumstance often adduced in reference to the Christian history of the day, that it was also kept as the anniversary of the Giving of the Law on Sinai, can hardly be said to claim a place in our considerations, as finding no ground in the sacred books; from which, and from which alone, any safe estimate of the typical import of the day can be derived. Now it is, that the grain of wheat which had been dropped into the ground, and had died, was to bring forth its first rich harvest of fruit; now that the ingathering of that harvest was to begin, of which the first-fruit was already in the garner of God. On this day the whole Church, assembled together in one place, became 'filled with the Holy Spirit:' lifted above the ordinary

condition of humanity into an ecstatic state, in which the common requisites of knowledge and utterance were superseded. Marvellous sounds and sights, the rushing wind and the tongues of flame, accompanied the spiritual phenomenon, and assured it to the senses as an objective reality. These signs, and that which followed them,—the speaking with tongues,—were but indications of the deeper and greater event itself, the being filled with the Holy Ghost. The rushing wind and the tongues of flame passed away in a few minutes, the speaking with tongues in a few years: but the event of Pentecost remains in all its presence and all its power. The filling, teaching, indwelling Spirit, is as much with us, as He was with them. And none makes a right use of this book, who does not keep this ever in mind. Two more mistakes respecting this day's history are common. One is, to imagine that it is of the *Apostles only* that the whole is related. Any fair examination of the narrative will remove this impression. Throughout the latter part of ch. i. we are in presence of the assembled believers, the hundred and twenty names of ver. 15. In ver. 23, it is 'they' who 'appoint two;' in ver. 24, 'they' who pray;

in ver. 26, 'they' who give forth their lots; in ch. ii. 1, 'they' who are 'all with one accord in one place;' in ver. 3, it is upon 'each of them' that the fiery tongues rest. There is no change of subject throughout. And with this agree the words and acts of the Twelve. It is they, with St. Peter as their spokesman, who stand forward before the rest, and point to them as not being drunken, but the subjects of the fulfilment of the prophetic word. And in the terms of that word, as cited, the same is corroborated. That which was happening was an example of the outpouring of the Spirit upon 'all flesh.' Among those who were speaking with tongues were the holy women; and in the prophetic text we have, 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,' and, 'on the servants and hand-maidens will I pour out of my Spirit.'

Connected with this mistake is another, viz., the idea that on this occasion was conferred on the Apostles the permanent gift of speaking in various languages, to qualify them for their missionary work. There is for this no foundation whatever in the sacred text. It is inconsistent both with all we read afterwards respecting the

gift of tongues, and with every indication which we subsequently find of their course of proceeding in preaching in strange lands; not to mention, that it would remove altogether the region of the Spirit's great work of apostolic missions from the firm ground of aided human endeavour, into the vague, unsatisfactory realm of standing miracle, and superseding of the normal conditions of speech and thought. That the idea was unknown to the ancient Church, is plain from its testimony that St. Mark accompanied St. Peter *as his interpreter:* that it found no countenance from the greatest expositor of the fourth century, we see from Chrysostom, who, in explaining Acts xiv. 14, accounts for the Apostles not interfering before, by the notice inserted by St. Luke, that the words, 'The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men,' were uttered 'in the speech of Lycaonia,' and were *therefore unintelligible to them.* This mistake, I said, is closely connected with the other. If the gifts here related were confined to the Apostles, then they might naturally be supposed to have some connexion with the future apostolic work of preaching the Gospel: but seeing that they were shared by many, women included, to

whom fell no such duty of preaching, that supposition is entirely out of place. When we come, in the proper place, to speak of the gift of tongues, it will be seen how totally different it was from the lasting endowment of ability to speak in a tongue which had never been learned. That it took the form, in the ecstatic rapture, of various languages, understood by the pious strangers then present in Jerusalem, is nothing to the point. It is enough answer to those who would make this into an argument, that no distinction can be sharper and plainer than that drawn by St. Paul between the gift of tongues, as a temporary, ecstatic, supernatural sign, and preaching, as a permanent, spiritual, convincing ordinance.

But we must pass rapidly onward. The Church is now constituted. On all its members alike is poured out the Spirit of God. The oil of anointing, which was shed abundantly on its glorified Head, has descended even to the skirts of the raiment.

But now, contemporaneously with this its first constitution, its definite government and approved teaching begins. No sooner is there a Church, than there is also a separated ministry. Peter

stood forth—it is the formal word *stathcis*—with the eleven, and *lifted up his voice*—again the formal expression by which a course of teaching is ushered in. And the first apostolic testimony is borne—*to whom?* Formally again, to the men of Judea, and all that dwell in Jerusalem—to the men of Israel; not only to the multitude then present, but to the nation which had crucified the Lord, and whom now by His ministers He calls to repentance.

On the rich and weighty contents of this first sermon I would dwell, but must not. Nothing in it is accidental, nothing occasional. Every word told then; every word tells now. The result is that with which we are now mainly concerned. As the Apostle speaks, strange compunctions enter the breasts of those that hear. The crucified malefactor exalted above the heavens—the crushed impostor become Lord and Christ, and shedding forth this which they saw and heard—what had they done? what should they do? They are pierced in heart, looking on Him whom they had pierced. The very word used is the same. They cast themselves at once on the guidance of those whom, but a little before, they had regarded

as conspirators leagued to deceive them. The change within them is begun already; and the Apostle's advice in reply is but to complete the change, and ratify it by baptism into the name of Jesus as their Lord.

And thus does the Church receive her first increment, and hundreds become thousands; and the first is given of those remarkable descriptions of the blessed unanimity and community which prevailed.

Still, this is but a beginning. The testimony must wax onward. It must be forced on the attention of the rulers: of those very men who had condemned the Lord to death, and had insisted, when Pilate would have let Him go. And so, in the face of all the people, at the very gate of the Temple and at the hour of prayer, a notable miracle is wrought, which cannot be left unnoticed by the authorities. The despised name of Jesus of Nazareth is proved to be the source of divine healing power, not only of ecstatic influence which they might attribute to natural causes. With that effect of this Name came the preaching of Him as Lord and Christ, and of the truth of His resurrection. These things could no longer be borne.

The Apostles are summoned before the rulers. The despised men of Galilee stand before the Council which had condemned their Master. The power of the Holy Ghost in them is mighty and irresistible, and the first effort of the foe is baffled. All is triumph to the Church: triumph without, and increase of power in the apostolic testimony; and peace, and unity, and community within.

As we pass onward with this rapid sketch, the progress of the Church is like the lifetime of a plant: the trying wind, the biting frost, the withering blight, all tending to stablish, strengthen, settle, even till the nations take refuge in the shadow of the spreading branches. The next trial is from within. Falsehood and double-dealing appear in this chosen band of witnesses to the Lord. So indeed is it ever to be; wheat and tares growing together till the harvest. But this first example, this lying to the Holy Ghost present in the Apostles, is not to pass without that which shall carry terror to all who would in like manner bring a double heart into the fold of Christ. And thus the power and the influence of the rising Church waxes onward: all is success, all is hope fulfilled; multitudes are added to the Lord; daily the

Apostles, in the most conspicuous part of the Temple, bear their testimony to the Resurrection of the Lord, standing separate and unrivalled, and magnified by all the people. As they pass along the streets the sick are brought out, and laid for the healing influence of even the shadow of Peter passing by. Crowds throng to Jerusalem out of the country round, bringing their sick; the pouring out of praise is universal, all are healed.

Once more the foe bestirs himself. The Apostles are cast into prison; but no sooner cast in, than by angelic hands delivered, and commanded to continue their testimony in the ears of the people. Again they are brought before the Council; gently, for they were the favourites of the people. Even in the Council itself they find an advocate: 'Let these men alone; may be you are fighting against God.' However, this time persecution tastes blood, and the Apostles suffer shame for the name of the Lord. But as the shame, so waxes the joy; as the prohibition, so advances the spirit and power of the teaching. Still the Church in Jerusalem grows and spreads. New arrangements have to be made, new offices devised for the carrying on of its machinery.

And now we have risen to the very summit of the first, the Jerusalem career of the Church's triumph. In ch. vi. 7, 8, we have the joyous record of increase and success for the last time. All, up to this point, seems to bid fair for the conversion of the entire Jewish people. The number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and we even read that a great multitude of the *priests* were obedient unto the faith.

Meantime on the horizon is arising the little cloud, which ere long shall cover the heaven with clouds and wind: and the distant howling of the tempest is already heard. 'The persecution that arose about Stephen,' scattering abroad the Jerusalem Church, sowing far and wide the seed of the Word,—this is the opening event of the next period of the history. And for our treatment of the next period we will reserve it.

Our usual duty yet remains: to give to the English reader a list of revised readings and renderings in the six chapters through which we have been passing.

Among the alterations which should be made in the *text* itself, to bring it into accord with our oldest authorities, the following are the principal:

In ch. i. 25, *part* should be 'the place.' Judas had left the place which his Lord had appointed him, to go to *his own* place.

In ch. ii. 1, for '*with one accord*,' read 'together.' In ver. 23, instead of '*ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*,' read and render, 'ye by the hand of lawless men nailed up and slew.' In ver. 30, instead of '*he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne*,' read, 'he would set one upon his throne:' and in the next verse, for '*his soul*,' read 'he.' Last verse, read and render, 'The Lord brought together daily more that were in the way of salvation.'

In ch. iii. 18, read, 'by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer.' In vers. 19, 20, read and render, 'that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that He may send Him who was before appointed your Messiah, even Jesus.' In ver. 22, omit '*unto the fathers*.'

In ch. iv. 25, read, 'who by the mouth of our father David, thy servant, hast said by the Holy Spirit.' In ver. 27, read, 'gathered together in this city.'

In ch. v. 24, the words, '*the high priest*

and' are omitted by most of our oldest authorities.

In ch. vi. 3, for '*may*,' read 'will.' In ver. 8, for '*faith*,' read 'grace.'

The corrections necessary to bring the English version into stricter accordance with the original text, are in this portion far more numerous.

In ch. i. 2, render, 'had given commandments to the Apostles whom he had chosen through the Holy Ghost.' In the original, it is doubtful whether the words 'through the Holy Ghost' belong to 'had given commandments' or to 'had chosen;' and this ambiguity should be preserved in the version. In ver. 6, render, 'They therefore came together and asked Him.' In ver. 7, '*power*' should be 'authority.' As it stands, it misleads the reader, looking as if it represented the same word as 'power' in the next verse, whereas it does not. In ver. 8, render, 'by the Holy Ghost coming upon you.' '*Witnesses unto* me' would be better, as it stands in the original, 'my witnesses.' In ver. 12, render, 'which is nigh unto Jerusalem, being a Sabbath-day's journey.' In ver. 13, it should stand, 'they went up into the upper chamber where they were sojourn-

ing, namely, Peter,' etc. The words 'the son' and 'the brother' are not expressed in the original. In ver. 16, and whenever the words occur, '*Men and brethren*' should be 'Brethren' only. It does not represent two classes of persons, but one: 'men who are brethren,' 'brother men.' (This will not be noticed again.) In ver. 17, '*part*' should be 'the lot,' being the same word as that so rendered in ver. 26. In ver. 22, it should stand, as in the original, 'must one become a witness.' In ver. 24, for '*shew whether of those two Thou hast chosen*,' 'appoint one of these two, him whom Thou hast chosen.' In ver. 25, for '*by transgression fell*,' the original has merely 'passed away.' In ver. 26, for '*gave forth their lots*,' 'cast lots for them.'

In ch. ii. 1, render, 'while the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled.' In ver. 6, '*when this was noised abroad*,' should be 'when this sound (*literally*, noise) took place.' In ver. 10, for '*strangers of Rome*,' 'Romans who are sojourning here.' In ver. 13, '*new* wine' should more properly be 'sweet wine.' In ver. 23, 'delivered *by*,' should be 'delivered according to.' Ver. 29, for '*is both dead and buried*,' 'both died and was buried.'

Ver. 34, for '*is not ascended*,' 'did not ascend.' In ver. 40, it should stand, 'Be saved from this crooked generation.' The Apostle does not command them to *save themselves*, but to receive Christ's salvation. Ver. 42, '*and fellowship*' should be 'and in community:' it is a separate matter, not connected, as 'doctrine' is, with 'the Apostles.' In ver. 46, '*from house to house*' should be 'at home.'

In ch. iii. 1, for '*went up together*,' it should be simply 'were going.' Ver. 12, '*at this*,' should be 'at this man:' and '*holiness*' should be 'godliness,' as this word is always elsewhere rendered in the New Testament. Ver. 13, '*Son*' ought to be 'Servant:' and in ver. 15, '*whereof*' should be 'of whom.' In ver. 21, for '*which*,' which now is ambiguous, substitute 'of which times.' In ver. 26, for '*Son*,' render 'Servant:' and for '*to bless you*,' 'blessing you.'

In ch. iv. 13, better, 'when they beheld the freedom of speech of Peter and John, having also previously known, etc.: and they recognised them, that they had been with Jesus.' Ver. 27, '*child*' should be 'Servant.'

In ch. v. 19, '*the* angel' should be 'an angel:'

and in ver. 21, '*early in the morning*' should be 'at the break of day.' In ver. 24, 'doubted *of*,' would be better 'doubted concerning.' In ver. 37, for '*taxing*,' substitute 'enrolment.' In ver. 39, 'if it *be*' ought to be 'if it is,' retaining 'be' in the previous verse. The distinction is in the original, and is intended. In ver. 41, render 'they departed rejoicing from the presence of the council, because they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the Name,' viz., of Christ. Ver. 42, it should be 'Jesus the Christ:' *i.e.*, as the Christ.

In ch. vi. 1, '*multiplied*' should be 'multiplying;' and '*Grecians*' should be 'Grecian Jews,' or 'Hellenists.' They were not Gentiles, as the word *Grecians* would seem to imply. In ver. 2, for '*reason*,' substitute 'our pleasure:' and in ver. 7, for '*company*,' 'multitude.'

II.

JERUSALEM TO ANTIOCH.

HITHERTO, the career of the Church has been all prosperity. Paradise seems to have been regained for the sons of men. Outward danger has been triumphantly overcome. Inward danger has been effectually repressed by apostolic authority. The brightest visions of human happiness could hardly find more glowing description than in St. Luke's words which set forth the state of those who believed. All things in common; the general possession administered by men miraculously endowed with the Holy Ghost; daily worship in the Temple; daily commemoration and spiritual participation of the Body and Blood of the Lord; gladness and singleness of heart, and holy mutual love: these are the characteristics of the happy band of pious Jews, not yet called Christians, which was rapidly increasing in Jerusalem. But this second Eden may not abide, any more than

the first. Human infirmity is present still; present even in the highest spirit of man; and in that, even when most specially dwelt in by the Spirit of God.

I said that the distribution of the common possession had hitherto rested with the Apostles themselves. Than this nothing can be clearer. The money brought in was laid at their feet. And had they before this been in the habit of delegating the duty of distributing it to others, we should not now first hear of that delegation being determined on and carried out. But the Apostles were themselves Jews. Though two of them, Andrew and Philip, bear names of Greek origin, and on one occasion (John xii.) seem to have been the channel of communication between Greeks and our Lord, there is no reason to suppose that they were other than pure Jews by descent. Andrew indeed was own brother to Simon Peter.

Where personal selfishness and greed are absent, national party spirit may still be found. Complaints arose from the Hellenistic Jews who were believers—men of Grecian descent, adopted into the family of Israel—that their widows were overlooked in the daily ministration of the common fund of the Church.

Let us notice how commonplace, and how uni-

form in all time, are these grounds of murmuring and of division in the Church. I knew a neighbourhood where, in the first years of a faithful and energetic ministry, it was made ground of grave censure of the minister that, in the increase of communicants, persons from other villages consumed the parish bread and wine! Let it be Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome, Geneva, England, Scotland, America — our infirmities, our party strifes, are in type the same ; and the most trivial and everyday matters will break in among and disturb the exercise of spiritual gifts and graces.

At the same time, in the good providence of God, from these unwelcome and unseemly disturbances spring the most important onward steps in the Church's progress. Even so it was in this first example. Now first is the ministry widened, and passes beyond the apostolic body to another class of men, set over this special need by laying on of hands and prayer. That every one of these should bear names more or less Grecian, is easily accounted for by the necessity out of which their appointment arose. That they were chosen not by the Apostles, but by the multitude of the brethren, is a circumstance not lightly to be passed over.

But another thing also is worthy of our notice.

These seven men are not, and are not intended to be, mere distributors of alms. The solemnity of their appointment, the fact that they are the only order of ministers co-ordinate with the Apostles, forbids such a supposition : and as we read, the facts themselves entirely preclude it. These men, 'full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom,' were not likely to set aside all spiritual gifts, and to serve tables only. The result of their appointment seems to have been the setting at rest of the present trouble, and is expressly stated to have resulted in a great increase of the number of believers ; so that even of the priestly order itself, a great multitude were obedient to the faith.

And now springs out of this matter another, of inestimably greater import in the Church's history. One of these seven, Stephen, soon rises far above the rest in activity and notoriety. He exercises among the people miraculous gifts, hitherto confined to the Apostles only. He disputes with the Grecian Jews, and in their synagogues silences all objections by the wisdom and the power of the Spirit with which he spoke. The special character of his preaching may be surmised from the immediate result, and from the kind of charge which was brought against him. He had told them, as

he afterwards told the Council, that the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; he had ventured to hint at the transitoriness of the Mosaic dispensation, and the indications, in its most solemn ordinances, of the permanent spiritual reign of Jesus of Nazareth. By words like these the active enmity of fanatical Judaism was awakened. Defeated in argument, it issues in force. The Grecian Jews stir up the people by exaggerated and false reports of Stephen's sayings. Hitherto the multitude has been with the Apostles. Hitherto the Council has been afraid to proceed because of the people. But now the nature of the charge at once alienates the popular affection. As before 'Hosanna' became 'Crucify,' so now. Stephen is dragged before the Council, charged with having spoken blasphemous words against the holy place and against the law.

It is not my purpose to follow the history into the details of each narrative, or I would willingly have paused over every incident in this great crisis of the Church, and have traced the connexion and effect of every portion of Stephen's wonderful speech. My object is rather to point out in short compass the meaning and coherence of the *whole*,

and to trace, as it were, in a bird's-eye view, the paths by which the Church spread from point to point in the prospect. It must suffice, then, to say of this long and somewhat difficult apology, that not a word of it is wasted; that the great theme of it is to show that the holy people had been rebellious from the first, and that holy places made with hands had never been the dwelling-place of God. Before it had come to an end, the martyr, provoked, most probably, by the impatience or hostile expressions of his hearers, burst forth into a torrent of fervid vituperation of the hard-heartedness and rebellion of Israel. Upon this the fury of his enemies was aroused. They seized him, and dragged him forth out of the city, and stoned him.

This opened the flood-gates of persecution. From being a scene of triumph, Jerusalem became a scene of deadly peril. One foe is prominent among the rest, the 'young man named Saul,' who makes havoc of the Church, searches houses for the faithful, and takes multitudes of both sexes to prison.

And now commences a new period and form of the Church's activity. Hitherto her course has

been led under the immediate guidance of the Apostles. The present dispersion is to prove, for the first time, that she has work to do without the Apostles. It was indeed still their work, but their work by delegation to others. Judea and Samaria (the two next localities, be it observed, which the Lord had prescribed for the testimony to Him) are filled with the scattered members of the Church; and the afterward familiar expression, 'preaching the word,' first meets the eye. Let us notice, also, another expression, now found for the first time—'the church which was in Jerusalem.' We are now about to hear, not of the Mother Church only, but of churches in other parts. And in this multiplication of churches, let us not fail to observe how the Spirit, in His manifold gifts and strength, asserts His independence of mere official co-operation of men. Of all offices, none surely was ever so honoured and so distinct as that of the Apostles. In the infancy of the Church, it seemed that none but they were ever to lead or to enlarge it. 'Of the rest, durst no man join them,' as with great power they gave witness to the Resurrection of Jesus. And now, while their official work is yet but midway, and much remains for them to do,

the very first dispersion of the Gospel is carried on without them. The Spirit, working faith in man, is not bound. He is as powerful, in His voice of persuasion, in the servant and handmaid, in the babe and suckling, as in the Apostle and the bishop. But let us also observe, that, although remaining in Jerusalem, the Apostles are not laid aside. No sooner does the successful preaching of another of the seven, Philip, make the founding of a church in Samaria imminent, than two of the chief Apostles are sent down to them; and the formal bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit takes place by their hands. The founding and ruling of the Church, the orderly assembly of believers, is bound to the appointed offices and officers in the Church: but the spread of the Gospel from heart to heart, from the living voice to the pricking conscience, is not thus bound. Every Christian is not a church-officer, not a conferrer of spiritual gifts, not an administrator of the sacraments, not a public preacher, or reader of God's Word; but every Christian is a witness of Christ, and, if need so be, a missionary of Christ to his brethren.

Let us pass on, noting as we pass any steps which are taken to assure the inward purity of the

Church, or to extend its range without. To the first of these belongs that second protest against the base lust of lucre in holy matters, which is furnished by the proposal of Simon Magus and its indignant rejection by the Apostles; and to the second belongs the providentially prepared meeting between the deacon Philip and the Æthiopian eunuch, who, being taught the truth respecting Jesus, beyond doubt became the bearer of the 'good tidings' to his distant home.

And now the dawn of day is brightening rapidly onward; and He who at first commanded light to shine out of darkness, raises, in an unexpected quarter of the horizon, a burning and a shining light. I have ever felt that, among all the visible interpositions of God's providence in history, none is so clear, or so worthy of our admiration, as the preparation and career of the young man Saul. That we may the better see this, let us briefly review the situation of the Church and the world in the time at which we have arrived. The Church, built upon the foundation of the old covenant, and destined to carry God's building to its completion, has excited the bitter hatred of Judaism proper.

This latter must either wane before it, or crush it. This is one great enigma to be solved: to fuse into one the strictness of Judaism and the belief in Jesus Christ. But look again. The Gospel is for all mankind; is to be received by the persuaded reason, to become wisdom to the enlightened intellect, to feed the yearnings of the loftiest spirit; and the intelligent nations of heathendom are facing the new religion in all the pride of highly cultivated intellect, and flushed with the triumphs of transcendent genius. A second problem then is, to fuse into one the simplicity which is in Christ and the subtilties of human philosophy; to show that He is made to man the highest wisdom, and that the discourse concerning Him can take up into itself all the materials, of which ages of the training of the human understanding have taught the use. There yet remains a third difficulty—less in dimensions and character, but not less needful to be overcome. We are treating of a time in the world's history when human life was of small account, and personal safety can hardly be said to have existed. Any human instrument undertaking the practical solution of either of these great problems,

must soon have been borne down by hostile influences, and crushed in the attempt.

Now let us again review our ground. In the fusing of Christianity and Judaism, what and who is needed? No shallow observer of the customs and prejudices of Judaism will serve our purpose; nor, on the other hand, any who shall have fallen short in his estimate of the entire freedom of Christianity, and the full extent of its encroachments on Judaism. The man whom we seek must be a pure Jew by birth, and by education imbued with the fullest and deepest knowledge both of the law itself, and of that fabric of human traditional interpretation which the Rabbis had built up around it.

Then as to our second requisite. It will obviously be hard to combine in one man the endowments which we have just mentioned, with this other, no less necessary, that he should have been versed in the Greek tongue, which was then the universal vehicle of thought and argument; should have been trained in Gentile habits of joining thought to thought; and should have acquired that degree of acquaintance with heathen literature, which might enable him to dispute with

effect in Grecian schools and among Grecian audiences.

Our third difficulty could only be overcome by one who should possess the privilege, at this time not so common as it afterwards became, of Roman citizenship,—which might, by the peculiar immunities attached to it, exempt him from arbitrary punishment at the caprice of petty provincial officers, and give him the right of appeal to the great central power at Rome.

I need hardly say that all these qualifications were united in Saul of Tarsus. First, he was of unexceptionable Jewish descent: an Hebrew of Hebrews. Then he was brought up at Jerusalem, under Gamaliel, the most distinguished Pharisee of his time. Even more: he had been himself a keen and unsparing foe of Jesus and His Gospel. He had, for himself and for others, exaggerated to the utmost the antagonism between Christianity and Judaism. He had looked down, in his anxiety to prove their irreconcilableness, into the gulf which parted them; and was not likely to attempt lightly or flimsily to bridge it over. He was the man, if ever there was one, to set forth the full freedom of the Gospel of Christ, and its

independence of Mosaic customs and ordinances. For these qualities, he had himself hated and persecuted it.

Again, he was born, and spent at all events many important years of his youthful life, at Tarsus, one of the principal seats of Grecian learning. There, he had acquired mastery of the Greek language, as then spoken and written in the East: and had read those authors whose sayings he afterwards quoted in dispute with Gentiles, and in his epistles to Grecian churches. Educated half at Jerusalem, half in Cilicia, his mind had become accustomed to that form of logical argument in words, and of joining thought to thought, from which the pure Jewish mind was alien.

And add to all this, that as a native of Tarsus he was born with the rights of Roman citizenship, which others, even in high station, had to acquire at much cost.

I have said nothing as yet of personal qualifications. Yet these were to the full as marvellous. Hardly ever was man born with more qualities tending to enforce persuasion, or to acquire influence over his fellows. Ardent, sympathetic, universal in his regards, and able to cast himself

into every other man's position; within certain limits becoming all things to all men, but absolutely immovable as to compromise beyond these limits; carrying all in his heart, and making every man's griefs and joys his own; with tears for every sorrow, and glowing terms of endearment and congratulation ever on his tongue; master at the same time, of the most melting exhortation, and the keenest and most delicate irony; pouring out his words, which crowded one another to keep pace with the rapidity of his phases of thought, flying from proof to proof, and from one indignant refutation to another; sometimes seemingly forgetful of his main subject, while he pursues word after word which have sprung up along the path of his disputation, then returning to it again, in like manner again to desert it: till at last all these off-lying ideas, and images, and allusions, are bound up together in the majestic and overwhelming conclusion. Such was the mind, and such was the heart, of which God made choice, to bring about the greatest revolution ever wrought in the history of man.

If we ask what were the outward characteristics of one who was to do so mighty a work, we find

them summed up by himself in representing the aspect of him as shown to his enemies :—his bodily presence was weak, his speech was contemptible. He was afflicted, at all events from the time of his conversion, with a nervous malady, accompanied probably with feebleness of sight, of which he speaks as his thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan sent to buffet him; and of which, when he prayed repeatedly that it might be removed from him, the Lord spoke as weakness, wherein His strength was to be perfected. Nor must the wonderful endurance and self-spending be omitted, which have rendered St. Paul one of the most notable among men. What a record of his labours and sufferings has he given us in that summary in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians! How he ever came to be 'Paul the Aged,' might be matter of marvel, did we not remember Who was conserving him, and for what end. All elements of danger, all details of adventure, all anxieties and toils, seem summed up in his one person. Europe and Asia are full of him. 'From Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum,' is but his note of journey made half way. The deserts have seen him struggling with their sand-storms; the rivers have been

breasted by his arm; the deep has held him, hour after hour, drifting solitary on its surface. Again and again ocean has cast him shipwrecked to land, and land has yielded him, full of fresh holy enterprise, to ocean. Disputing in the synagogue, working at the hair-cloth loom, singing at midnight in the prison, kneeling, and mingling his tears with his farewell prayers on the Syrian or Milesian shore, preaching amidst the marble temples on Mars' Hill at Athens, thanking God and taking courage on the broad stones of the Appian Way; clanking his chain as he writes in his hired house at Rome; where, and in what employ, do we not find this strange fervent man, this vessel of God's election for the second founding of His Church?

Such, then, was he whom the Lord grasped with His own hand, and rescued from the ranks of foes and persecutors for His own service.

From the conversion of Saul, the history of St. Luke's second treatise assumes a wider range. It is henceforth devoted in the main to following the labours and journeys of the new Apostle. Only while he is laid aside at Tarsus, waiting and ripening for his great work, does St. Peter again appear as the chief actor in the narrative. And when he

so appears, it is to pave the way for the missionary agency of St. Paul. After that, we see him, except in the council of the Apostles, but once more. After that, the Apostles themselves, and the Jerusalem church, appear but as pendants to the action of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

It required no less than a special interposition by vision and voice from heaven, and even after these, a special command and direct action of the Spirit, to bring about the admission of Gentiles, as such, into the Church of Christ. He to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven had been committed, is chosen to open the door of faith to the Gentiles. Had not the descent of the Spirit in the house of Cornelius taken place, those Cyprians and Cyrenians who, being dispersed on the persecution which arose about Stephen, preached the word to Gentiles as well as Jews, would have been repudiated by the central authority in the Church; and even the work of Barnabas and Paul must have gone on in separation from James, and the Apostles and elders, in the holy city. As it was, the Gentile mission was watched for many a year with the strictest jealousy. Within the limits of the purest faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God

and the Redeemer, there subsisted in the apostolic church two parties, the Jewish and the Grecian; the former, in its rigid conservatism, represented by St. James, the brother of the Lord, and the latter by St. Paul. In the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude his brother, we discern no trace of any 'feeling' inconsistent with rigid conformity to Christian Judaism; and even after the question of the general obligation of circumcision was settled in the negative by the council at Jerusalem, we find a remarkable account of St. Peter, who had been walking in the full liberty of the Gospel with St. Paul at Antioch, wavering and oscillating back again into the limits of strict legal observance on the arrival of messengers from the Judaizing church of Jerusalem. Nay, so great was the influence of the re-assertion of the venerable old customs, that even Barnabas himself, who had been the first, even apparently before the matter of Cornelius, to recognise the grace of God in the Gentile converts, was carried away with their dissimulation, and began pulling down that which he had helped to build. It required, as we read in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, all the plain speaking and fervour of St. Paul,—it

required an open rebuke of St. Peter before them all, to assert again the universality of Christian liberty, and the nullity of the law as recommending men to God. Such was the great revolution in men's thoughts, which the new Apostle was raised up to work. There is reason to believe that during his lifetime its ferment never subsided; that however the whole apostolic body were at unity as to the central verities of the faith, there was ever this effervescent margin of differing views as to the extent of Gentile liberty in the Church. And at this we need not wonder. With so considerable an element of Judaism as every congregation contained, it was necessary, as well as natural, that the transition to the full freedom of the Gospel should be very gradual, and that no step in it should be accomplished until its ground had been firmly and solidly assured. Thus we find that in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, Philippians, and even as late as those to Timothy and Titus, St. Paul is ever employed in settling questions between the Jewish and Gentile elements in the churches, or in denouncing Judaizing practices which were lingering among the converts.

I have dwelt thus long upon this matter, because it in fact carries the history of the Church with it. As soon as it became evident that the wider range of the Gentile world, as such, was destined for the action of the Church, it also became evident that Jerusalem was no longer a fit centre for its operations. The holy city could serve as the permanent metropolis for those only who might retain the idea of Jewish obligation, or who, at all events, even when this was overcome, clung to the associations of the religion in which they had been born and educated. For the pure Gentile converts, Jerusalem would be an inconvenient and unwelcome place of resort. And accordingly, in the providence of God, no sooner does Gentile Christianity gain even the slightest degree of recognition, than the head-quarters of the Church's activity are transferred to Antioch. Coincident with the first mission of Barnabas, and his sympathy with the work wrought among the Gentiles, is the foundation of the Church in Antioch. Immediately on that change of mind, he set out for Tarsus, to seek Saul. It was evident that the work and the workman now at last required bringing together, and that the way of the Lord was

prepared. And thus we have Barnabas and Saul settled for a whole year at Antioch, teaching the great multitude who there had embraced the faith. And a significant notice is appended, marking the opening of the new era of church life and action. Hitherto, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth may have been known as a Jewish sect. But from the moment when God made it plain that pure Gentiles were to be among its members, such designation was no longer possible. With a new mission, and a new condition of membership, a new name arose. In Antioch, famed as we are told for the aptitude of its citizens to invent nicknames, the new appellation of 'Christian' was first given to the followers of Jesus. It appears at first to have been strictly a nickname. We do not find it occurring in any of the earlier apostolic epistles, nor indeed at all in the sacred canon, except once in the Epistles of St. Peter. And even then it appears rather as the name by which a persecuted believer is to suffer, cast at him by his enemies, than as his own name for himself.

With this opening of the new phase of the life of the Church, we close the present chapter. The rest of this wonderful book, so full of undying in-

terest and world-long edification, is, in the main, a record of missionary enterprise ; and to sum it up in our next chapter, will not require the proportion of our space, which it occupies in the second treatise of St. Luke.

The changes which are required in the English text in the present portion of the Acts, are : 1. owing to the testimony of our most ancient MSS. and other authorities :

In ch. vii. 48, for '*temples*,' read 'things.'

In ch. viii. 10, '*the great power of God*,' is literally, in all our oldest MSS., 'the power of God which is called great.' Ver. 37 should be altogether omitted. It is wanting in all our earliest MSS. and versions. It appears, from its being cited by Irenæus in the second century, to have been very early inserted into the text, as were many other passages now wanting in this book, which, more than any other of the New Testament, suffered interpolation (or abridgment, as the case may be) in the first ages.

In ch. ix. 5, 6, from '*it is hard . . .*' to the end of ver. 6, should be omitted. These words are not found in any Greek MS. in existence. They were put in here by Erasmus from the Latin

versions, having been first inserted from ch. xxvi. 14, and xxii. 10. In ver. 20, '*Christ*' should be 'Jesus.' Ver. 31 should stand, 'So then the church had peace throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, being built up and going onward in the fear of the Lord; and was multiplied by the exhortation of the Holy Spirit.'

In ch. x. 6, the words, '*he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do*,' should be omitted: as also should the words, '*which were sent unto him from Cornelius*,' in ver. 21. In ver. 23, read, 'And on the morrow he rose up and went away with them.'

In ch. xii. 10, the Cambridge MS. reads, 'they went out and descended the seven steps, and passed on through one street.' This is one of those places where the words seem to have been in the original text, and afterwards to have been excluded in the process of abridgment.

2. The alterations required, owing to our translators not having accurately represented the sense, are as follow:—In ch. vii. 1, it should be, 'But the high priest,' etc., and in ver. 2, '*Men, brethren*,' should be 'Brethren.' In ver. 20, '*exceeding fair*,' is, in the original, 'fair unto God.' In ver. 22,

'*learned*' does not mean 'learned' in our ordinary acceptation of the word, but is used in the old sense of '*taught*,' as in 'Learn me thy precepts.' It had better, therefore, be 'instructed.' In ver. 26, it should stand, 'and set them at peace, saying, "Ye are brethren,"' etc. In ver. 36, 'This Moses brought them out, showing wonders,' etc. In ver. 38, '*church*' is more properly 'assembly,' and '*lively*' should be 'living.' In ver. 44, it should stand, 'as He appointed who spake unto Moses.' In ver. 45, 'which also our fathers inheriting, brought in with Joshua at their taking possession of the Gentiles.' In ver. 46, '*desired*' should be 'asked permission.' In ver. 53, 'men who received the law at the injunction of angels.' In ver. 59, '*calling upon God*,' should be 'praying.' It is literally, 'invoking.'

In ch. viii. 6, '*hearing and seeing*,' should be, 'when they heard them, and saw.' In ver. 9, it should be 'Simon, which was beforetime in the same city, using sorcery and bewitchings,' etc. In ver. 13, it should be 'signs and great miracles.' In ver. 20, 'thou thoughtest to acquire the gift of God.' In ver. 26, instead of '*and the angel*,' 'but an angel;' and in the same verse, for '*Gaza*,

which is desert,' 'Gaza: this way is desert.' In ver. 30, 'Yea, but understandest thou,' etc. Ver. 39, 'caught away Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more; for he went on his way rejoicing.'

Ch. ix. 1, omit '*out*:' 'breathing' means both *breathing in*, inhaling, and *breathing out*, exhaling. In ver. 2, for '*this way*,' read 'the way.' Ver. 15, '*the Gentiles*' should be 'nations.' In ver. 21, render, for perspicuity, 'destroyed in Jerusalem them that called on this name.' And in ver. 22, for '*very* Christ,' 'the Christ.' Ver. 24, for '*the gates*,' 'even the gates.' In ver. 29, '*Grecians*' are 'Grecian Jews.' In ver. 32, '*quarters*' is not expressed in the original; the meaning, perhaps, is rather, 'passed throughout all the believers.' In ver. 34, '*Jesus Christ*' should, in this place, be 'Jesus the Christ.'

In ch. x. 11, '*knit at the four corners*,' should be 'tied by four rope ends.' In ver. 15 it should stand, 'Those things which God hath cleansed, call not thou common.' In ver. 25, '*as Peter was coming in*,' should be 'when Peter had come in.' The word '*him*,' after 'worshipped,' may be right, but is not expressed in the original. In ver. 28,

'*but*' should be '*and*,' the stress in reading being on the 'ye' in the beginning of the verse, and on 'me' in the latter part. In ver. 36, '*all*' should be 'all men,' and the beginning of ver. 37 should be, 'Ye know the matter which was published;' and in the next verse, '*how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth*,' should be, 'Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him.' In ver. 40, 'shewed him openly,' is literally 'permitted him to become manifest.' In ver. 42, it should stand, 'which is ordained by God, Judge of quick and dead.' In ver. 47, '*water*' should be 'the water,' *i.e.*, the water commonly used for that ordinance.

In ch. xi. 4, it should stand, 'But Peter began and rehearsed unto them in order.' In ver. 5, '*corners*' should be 'ropes:' and in ver. 6 should stand, 'saw the four-footed beasts of the earth, and the wild beasts, and the creeping things, and the fowls of the air.' In ver. 9, 'what things God hath cleansed, those call not thou common.' In ver. 13, for '*an* angel,' 'the angel.' In ver. 17, '*who believed*,' should be 'when we believed,' *i.e.*, 'when we began to believe.' Ver. 19 should begin, 'So then they.' Before 'Jews' omit '*the*.' Ver. 20 should begin, 'But some of them,' and

instead of '*the Grecians*,' should stand 'Grecians also.' In ver. 21, for '*believed, and turned*,' should stand, 'which believed, turned.' In ver. 22, 'tidings of *these things*,' should be 'tidings of them,' viz., of the persons. In ver. 26, '*and the*,' should be, 'and that the.' In ver. 27, '*came*' should be 'came down.'

Ch. xii. 1, the rendering is, 'laid his hands upon certain of the church to vex them.' In ver. 4, instead of '*Easter*,' it should be 'the Passover.' In every other place in the New Testament but this, the word *pascha* is so rendered. In ver. 5, '*of* the church,' would now be expressed 'by the church.' In ver. 6, for '*would have brought*,' substitute 'was about to bring;' and '*the* keepers' should be 'keepers.' In ver. 7, 'an angel;' and instead of 'the *prison*,' 'the chamber.' In ver. 8, it should be, 'he did so:' the words '*so he did*,' do not, in modern English, mean quite the same thing. In ver. 12, '*had considered*,' should be 'knew.' Ver. 13 should begin, 'And when he had knocked;' and ver. 14, 'And knowing Peter's voice.'

III

ANTIOCH TO ROME.

OUR attention is now fixed on the church at Antioch. Jerusalem is no longer the mother of churches. The days of her place among the 'thousands of Israel' are numbered. The promptings of the missionary Spirit have departed elsewhere. At Antioch first His voice is heard, and the two, Barnabas and Saul, are specially designated for the work. But they were thus designated, be it remembered, in the midst of solemn prayer and fasting, and from among the number of appointed ministers of the church there. Before we are told of their designation, these particulars are emphatically impressed on us (ch. xiii. 1).

And now we begin a series of missionary journeys, which it is not our intention to follow in detail, but only to trace in so far as they bring out points essential to the understanding of the history, and to the development of the purpose of the writer.

From Antioch, the great stream of commerce flowed westward, down the river Orontes, to Seleucia, the port of the city. And as Antioch had been chosen as the second resting-place of the Church, because of its Gentile character, it was natural that the missionaries should be guided by the Holy Ghost, not eastward, to the land of primitive history, and of the springs of Judaism, but to the west, where lay the Gentile world with its intellect, and its arts, and its arms, to be won for the Gospel of Christ.

Westward—but whither? As they stood on the coast looking seaward, the native island of Barnabas lifted its blue hills in the horizon. The guidance of the Spirit fell in with the yearnings of the Apostle's heart, and Salamis in Cyprus witnessed the opening of the first missionary teaching. It may seem strange, that we hear of their preaching in Salamis only in the synagogues of the Jews. If I mistake not, the incident which follows is not unconnected with this circumstance. Whatever may have been their own intention about speaking the Word to the Gentiles, their purpose is hastened, or anticipated, by the Providence of God. They are sent for by the Roman governor of the island, and achieve the first vic-

tory of the Gospel in his person. This incident is notable for the first outbreak, in the rebuking and punishment of the sorcerer Bar-jesus, of the fervour and power of the Holy Ghost in Saul. Hitherto, Barnabas has been foremost, and Saul has kept in the background. Here first, and henceforward, Saul becomes 'the chief speaker.'

But here, also, we have in conflict together two of the influences which strove for the mastery of the heathen world. Paganism, as such, was worn out: its fables were seen through, its worship despised. There was in it no relief to the conscience, no satisfaction to the soul. On its wreck was arising the influence of Oriental magic, which, founded on the truth of Judaism, perverted it, by mingling with it the unhallowed rites and practices of superstition. It claimed intercourse with powerful spirits, and the gift of foretelling futurity. It gained influence and position for various designing men who were found about the courts of emperors and rulers. Here first, at Paphos in Cyprus, this new religious element came into decisive conflict with Christianity. Before this, at Samaria, it had been seen how alien the spirit of the Gospel was from that of the professors of magic: here it was to be seen which of the two was really in posses-

sion of gifts of power, and in communion with the Spirit of God. The result is the conversion of the deputy to the faith, and the overthrow and disgrace of Elymas.

Henceforward, we have in Scripture history no record of magic as an antagonist of the Gospel of Christ. We have indeed a faint trace of a cognate influence being at work in the Colossian church, but it is hardly traceable to the same source. Tradition tells us of conflicts between the Apostles Peter and Paul and Simon Magus, at Rome; and the subsequent history of the Church records the baneful influence of the magical doctrines of the East in mingling themselves with and corrupting the purity of the Christian faith.

Coincident with, rather than consequent upon, this triumph of the Gospel, is the change of appellation of the new Apostle from Saul to Paul. Such changes, on the part of Jews much employed and known among the Gentiles, were very common. The commentators give us a long list of them, all having the same feature as this,—the similarity in sound of the new name to the old one. Saul was a Hebrew name, unknown to Roman ears. Paulus was one of their own ordinary appellations. What more obvious, than the substitution of the well

known for the unknown? That Paulus was on this occasion also the name of the governor who was converted to the faith, may have rendered the change all the more obvious. But that the Apostle himself, as some have thought, took the new name as a kind of trophy of this his first missionary achievement, seems to me in the last degree improbable, and indeed inconsistent with the whole character of St. Paul. The name was given by others, rather than assumed by himself; given perhaps all the more readily on account of this resemblance, but given certainly in conformity with a practice so common as to need no justification other than its prevalence.

One particular is noticeable in the resumption of the narrative after the conversion of Sergius Paulus. We are told that 'Paul and his company' loosed from Paphos—the preference being at once given to St. Paul, as henceforth the chief person. This is the more to be observed, because up to this point St. Luke has been careful to allot the superior place to Barnabas: see ch. ix. 27; xi. 30; xiii. 1, 2, 7. The remaining places where Barnabas is placed first (xiv. 12, 14; xv. 12, 25, 37-41) seem to rest each upon reasons special to itself.

The course of the Apostles led them to the

opposite coast of Asia Minor. And here one of the band, forsaking them, returned to Jerusalem. We can hardly be wrong in ascribing the defection of John Mark, not to indisposition for the work, or fear of its hardships, but to the fact of his Jerusalem birth (which seems implied in ch. xii. 12), and his unreadiness to engage in a mission so pointedly to the Gentiles as this now promised to be. Thus his want of sympathy with the great object of St. Paul's ministry will fully account for the determination with which the great Apostle afterwards repudiated his co-operation for the second missionary journey (ch. xv. 36-41). We know, from Gal. ii. 13, that even Barnabas was not so fully convinced as might have been wished, with regard to the work among the Gentiles; and John Mark, his relative, would have formed, perhaps, with him a party against St. Paul in any question of a difficult nature which might arise.

Such considerations are the more forced on our minds, by finding that at the very first place where the Word is preached in Asia Minor, Antioch in Pisidia, the question as between Jew and Gentile assumes a decisive form. Here the Apostles are invited to speak in the synagogue; and St. Paul

delivers a long and solemn discourse inaugurating his commission to Israel. His invitation to them being deliberately rejected, and the Gentiles gladly receiving it, the ministry of the Word henceforth turns toward these latter, and an abundant harvest of Gentile converts is reaped. Henceforth waxes onward the conflict between the Apostle of the Gentiles and his own countrymen, the Jews. These last drive Paul and Barnabas out of Antioch in Pisidia; when, undeterred by their hostility, the Apostles renew their preaching in the synagogue at Iconium, they drive them thence also; at Lystra, where the people, recalling their old traditions of appearances of the Gods in human shape, would have worshipped Barnabas and Paul, unbelieving Jews from Antioch and Iconium persuade the fickle multitude to stone Paul, and cast him out of the city as dead. However, the Apostles are not daunted; they return the same way, building up the churches which they had already founded, and teaching the disciples that through much tribulation we must enter into the kingdom of God. All this is most important, as carrying on the Church to the decision of the great question between Jew and Gentile, now

immediately to be brought under dispute among the apostolic body.

The circumstances and the issue of the great apostolic council in Acts xv., are well known. Its importance cannot be overrated. It amounted to a deliberate sanction, by the whole Church assembled, of the proceedings of the two missionaries among the Gentiles: and it resulted in a decree, issued with the assertion of the divine authority of the Holy Spirit Himself, and of the Apostles and elder brethren, confirming the exemption of Gentile converts from the requirements of the Jewish ceremonial law. One or two points only were reserved, and those rather of necessary obligation than of special enactment.

We now come to the second great missionary journey; in noting which we shall observe the plan before laid down, and adduce such things only as concern the larger features of the progress of the Church.

The journey was to have been undertaken by both the Apostles, at the instigation of St. Paul. Why it was not thus carried out, we have already explained. Let us cast a glance at the position of matters in Antioch at its commencement. Judas

and Silas, themselves prophets, *i.e.*, endowed with the faculty of speaking in the Spirit to the Church, had come down from Jerusalem with the decree from the council. We can hardly be wrong in recognising this as the time spoken of in Gal. ii. 11 and following, when 'certain from James' came down to Antioch. Their arrival seems to have been a short time delayed after that of Paul and Barnabas, and another, now mentioned for the last time in Scripture story—even St. Peter himself. During the interval before their coming, St. Peter had been taking the full liberty granted him by the apostolic decision. But on their arrival he withdrew himself, and restricted his converse to those who lived as did the Jews. Of the two messengers, Judas and Silas, both of course were at one as to the main purport of the decree. But it would seem as if both were not at one as to the duty of Jews with regard to Gentile converts. The notice (ver. 33), that Judas returned to Jerusalem, whereas we find by ver. 30 (not by ver. 34, which is spurious,—see at the end of this section) that Silas remained in Antioch, seems to import, that the latter at all events was more in sympathy with the state of things at Antioch than the former;

an impression which is presently confirmed. The dissimulation of Peter, Barnabas, and others, with regard to the obligation of living as did the Jews, had evidently no small share in precipitating St. Paul into the determination, which the wish of Barnabas to take John Mark with them ripened into practice, to shake loose from him the influence and the co-operation of those who were not hearty in their determination to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. So, having chosen Silas as his companion, and having evidently the church at Antioch heartily on his side, he set out, passing through Syria, and traversing his native land, Cilicia, confirming the churches in the faith. Besides the general meaning which these words naturally bear, we are obviously led to understand that a special confirmation of their steadfastness is intended, viz., that which would be brought about by delivering to them the decrees of the council at Jerusalem, which had now become the charter of their Christian liberty.

The chief incident of this part of the new journey was the adoption of Timotheus, or Timothy, as a companion and helper of St. Paul. This young disciple, born of a Gentile father, but in-

heriting the true faith of Judaism from his mother and grandmother,—and well reported of by the churches in Lystra and Iconium,—appeared to the Apostle specially adapted to accompany and minister to him in his missionary work. That he took him and circumcised him, because of the Jews in those parts, is so far from being, as some have thought, inconsistent with his principles and practice on other occasions, that it furnishes us with an admirable illustration of his maxim of becoming to the Jews as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; and is, as Baumgarten has well shown, an example of the exercise of that liberty which was free to choose or to reject a particular course of action, according to the necessity of the case. His previous refusal to circumcise Titus at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 3), was again not inconsistent with this act, but was an exercise of the same liberty, acting under different circumstances.

The character of the course which Timothy accomplished as the minister of St. Paul, serving with him as a son with a father in the Gospel, will come before us for remark in our section on the Epistles to Timothy. At present I will only say, that this adoption of a fellow-labourer who was

half a Gentile, lay completely in the line of St. Paul's whole proceeding in his missionary life, and formed a marked step forward in his assertion of apostolic independence.

Of the Asiatic portion of the missionary work of this journey, we know but little in detail. Evidently, from hints furnished in the Epistles, it was full of incidents of importance, both to the territory passed through, and to the Apostle himself. Taking a northerly direction from Lycaonia, he traversed the great central province of Galatia, founding churches among its ardent and fickle people. There, as we learn from notices in his Epistle to them, he lengthened his stay, owing to being afflicted with feeble health, and was with them in weakness and fear and much trembling; and his constitutional trouble, probably some distressing nervous affection, seems to have proved a more than common interruption to his work (Gal. iv. 13). How long he was thus detained, we are not informed; but the circumstance is otherwise interesting to us, as perhaps connected with the accession to the missionary party of Luke, the physician, which took place very shortly afterwards. To this accession we owe the precision

and detail of the subsequent part of the narrative, during the whole of the incidents of which, even when the first person plural is not used, there is reason to believe that he accompanied St. Paul.

And now, guided by a Divine intimation, the apostolic band first set foot in Europe. The incidents at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Berœa, are well known to all. Pursued everywhere by the active enmity of the Jews, the party is constrained to break up for the present, and to convey away St. Paul from those who sought his life.

And thus we have him brought to Athens, and are introduced to one of the most remarkable episodes in his missionary history. Jerusalem, Athens, Rome,—these were the three great centres of interest in the ancient world. Each had its peculiar civilisation: each contributed an important and indispensable contingent to the training of mankind for the influences of the latter dispensation. Adopting the Scriptural threefold division of man into spirit, soul, and body, and understanding by the first of these the higher aspirations and communicated life arising from contact with God,—by the second, the intelligent animating principle of personality, by which we are distin-

guished from the lower orders of creation,—and by the third, the animal life, with its various phases of economical, social, and political well-being; then we may say, that to Jerusalem we owe the culture of man's spirit; to Athens, that of his soul; to Rome, that of his body. In each of these centres of humanity did the great Apostle testify to the faith of Christ, the regeneration of our whole nature.

But in none of them does his capacity for his wonderful work more signally appear, than at Athens. There, amidst the most subtle intellects of the age, in the presence of the highest examples of human art, on a spot the most signalized by the triumphs of human genius, does he plead for the purer faith and the higher philosophy, in a speech, of which it is not too much to say, that it is the most beautiful specimen extant in language, of fitting thoughts clothed in fitting words. The 'apples of gold in pictures of silver' were never more aptly exemplified. With the most exquisite tact, he introduces his subject by dwelling on the acknowledged tendencies and the patent confessions of his hearers; when it has been thus introduced, he confirms his sayings by the words of

their own poets; and in all his speech, ingratiates himself with them by the use of language and forms of thought to which their tastes and habits were accustomed.

But it was not in the metropolis of the human intellect that the permanent foundations of the Church in Europe are to be laid. The great and dissolute Corinth was at that time the capital of Greece; and there the Apostle fixes himself for eighteen months, founding the church with which we afterwards become so familiar.

Events are now hurried along in St. Luke's narrative, and in a few verses at the end of the eighteenth chapter we have related the return by Ephesus to Palestine, a visit to Jerusalem, a sojourn at Antioch, and a second journey through Galatia and Phrygia, to confirm the churches already founded.

At the end of this, we have the account of another long sojourn of St. Paul, and this time at Ephesus, the heathen metropolis, in arts, learning, and religion, of Asia Minor. At Ephesus he is brought into conflict with another form of prevalent superstition, and eventually encounters the hostility of the upholders of the great 'pil-

grimage church' of the lady of Ephesus, known and worshipped throughout Asia and the world. As we read the living description of the tumult, and the words of the speakers, the mind recalls scenes of travel among the hardly less than Pagan superstitions of modern Europe, and feels that the conflict between Satan and Christ is now much what it was in the earliest times.

When the tumult happened which this conflict occasioned, the Apostle was already intending to pass over into Europe, and then, after visiting Jerusalem, to see Rome. After the tumult, the former part of this intention was immediately carried out. The latter portion also followed, but in a manner very different from that proposed by the Apostle. Having stayed three months at Corinth, where the church required his presence, owing to the irregularities and the questions which are dealt with in the Epistles to the Corinthians,—he passed back into Asia, not without apprehension, which he touchingly expressed to the elders of Ephesus, that his course was drawing to an end. The Jews had been seeking his life at Corinth, and this had compelled him to adopt a different route to Asia from that which he had

intended. Many signs were given, that this his visit to Jerusalem would witness the culmination of their hatred against him. How this happened, is too well known to require notice here. It may suffice to remark, that the providential fact of his Roman citizenship saved him from their conspiracies; and that after a two years' detention in custody at Cæsarea, he set out, with Luke and Aristarchus, a prisoner, for Rome, to be brought before Cæsar, to whom he had appealed.

But before we advance further, we must not forget to cast a glance at the state of Gentile and Jewish Christianity, as shown by the incidents of this last recorded visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem. On his arrival, there appears to have been a reluctance to come into direct contact with the church; at all events without previous preparation. The band had been lodged at Cæsarea with Philip, now known as the Evangelist, who had been one of the seven—the former converter of the Samaritans and of the Ethiopian eunuch. There he had been prophetically warned, but in vain, of the dangers which awaited him in the Holy City; even their special form, the being delivered by the Jews to the Gentiles, being speci-

fied. His whole approach seems to have been marked with caution. His party are conveyed by those who accompanied them from Cæsarea, not at once to James and the church, but to an aged Cyprian disciple. Though it is stated that the brethren received them gladly, yet it would seem as if these words were rather to be understood of the greetings of individual believers, than of any enthusiastic welcome from the official heads of the church. On the next day there is a formal audience given by James and the elders of the Jerusalem church, Paul *and his company* being present; and a formal statement, a report, made by him of all that God had done by his ministry amid the Gentiles. Now let us notice the impression made on the assembled church by this narrative. First, they glorified God. They were not prepared to disown the work of God among the Gentiles, nor to deny to the Gentile church its proper and independent standing before God. As to these main points, the two parties were at one, as they were with regard to Him in whose name and to whose glory the work had been accomplished. But in this unity on the main point, there was still diversity and independence

in the views of the two parties on the standing of the Jewish Church. St. Paul stood compromised to the assertion that in Christ there was neither Jew nor Gentile. He had again and again affirmed the transitional and occasional character of the law of Moses, and the fact of absolute death to the law on the part of those who had become believers in Christ. The observance of feasts and sabbaths, the abstinence from meats, had been again and again declared by him to be things absolutely indifferent, except for secondary and temporary considerations. Nay, he had even charged those who maintained the necessity of circumcision, with causing apostasy from Christ. But now he stood face to face with men who upheld in their own persons the ancient obligations, and enforced them on the Jewish believers; with men who viewed all things through a Jewish medium, and could not entertain the idea of a Church of Christ dissociated from the ancient observations of times, and places, and ceremonies.

In some very beautiful remarks on this unity in the main in the midst of such weighty differences, Baumgarten bids us observe, that such ought ever to be the attitude towards each other observed by

the great parties in the Church: independence and firmness in their own course according to their consciences, and at the same time generous and unselfish recognition of God's work in and by each other.

See, he observes, how clear and pure is the conduct of each on this occasion. The Apostle of the Gentiles simply relating God's work done by him, without bringing into prominence the conflict in which he had been incessantly engaged with the very principles whose representatives were before him: and, on the other hand, the Apostle of the circumcision, and his company, glorifying God for the work thus accomplished, without forgetting, but at the same time without objecting, that it had been carried on in contravention of principles which they held dear as life itself.

In the manifestation of this unity in the midst of difference, we may, he thinks, account for the great earnestness of spirit with which St. Paul had made this one journey to Jerusalem, in spite of the warnings of danger which had been given him, and in spite of his own dim forebodings of a disastrous personal result. His own words to the elders of Ephesus at Miletus (Acts xx. 24), are

remarkable as bearing out this idea: 'I count not my life of any account to myself, in comparison with the finishing my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, the completing my testimony to the *Gospel of the grace of God*.' By these last words, he indicates that Gospel of liberty from the works of the law, which he preached among the heathen; and it was to obtain from the church at Jerusalem the full recognition of this work of God by him, that he was thus willing to risk his life, in the visit to the very stronghold of his enemies, the unbelieving Jews.

The reply of James and the elders is no less remarkable than what has been already noticed. It shows a state of things in the church which is worth our contemplation. 'Thou beholdest, brother, how many myriads there are among the Jews of believers, and all are zealous for the law: and they were instructed concerning thee, that thou teachest apostasy from Moses to all the Jews who are among the Gentiles, ordering them not to circumcise their children, nor yet to walk according to the customs.' It is surprising here to find, on the one hand, that the number of Jewish

believers is stated to be so large; and on the other, to see that the Jewish churches had already assumed so definite an attitude of hostility towards Pauline Christianity. With regard to the former point, we are led to suppose that there must have been, in the apostolic time, before the destruction of Jerusalem, a great outbreak of apparent success of the Gospel among the Jews, otherwise unknown to us. Indeed an ancient Christian writer, Hegesippus, tells us that at one time, from the great number of rulers who believed, the Scribes and Pharisees feared that the whole nation would acknowledge Jesus as their Messiah. And as to the other point, we may observe that the Jewish churches, in carefully circulating this adverse opinion of Paul and his teaching (the term used is a remarkable one: they were orally instructed, '*catechised* respecting thee'), are exhibited to us as already in that course of rapid decline from the purity of the faith, the progress of which we may trace in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where apostasy from Christ is the sin of which above all others they stand in peril,—and in the messages of the Spirit to the Churches in the Apocalypse.

The advice given to St. Paul by James and the

elders, wise as it doubtless was, with a view to conciliate the Jewish believers, proved in the end the means of awakening against him the bitter hostility of his own people. The Asiatic Jews, believing, or feigning to believe, that they had seen with him, on one of his visits to the temple, Trophimus a Gentile, one of his companions, stirred up the people against him, and threw all Jerusalem into uproar.

What followed is well known to us all, and need not be dwelt upon here. Only let the reader observe, that at the very mention of Paul's mission to the *Gentiles*, the riot breaks out afresh; clearly showing what was the salient point of the enmity against him;—not the preaching of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, but the admission of the Gentiles to equal privilege with the Jews themselves.

We pass rapidly on to the end: reminding the reader that the delightful narrative of the voyage and the shipwreck has in our time received most interesting elucidation from the little work of Mr. Smith of Jordanhill, in which he has laid down minutely and satisfactorily, from personal nautical observation, and from that of others, every par-

ticular of the course, and every detail of the disaster. I cannot help expressing a wish that the excellent author of this little treatise might be induced to put it into a small tract for popular use. I know of nothing which has been written on the Scriptures in our day, that has tended so much to give life and reality to a portion of the sacred narrative.

It is hard for one who loves the very stones of Rome, to pass over all the thoughts which arise in his mind, as he thinks of the great Apostle treading the rude and massive pavement of the Appian Way, and passing under that arch of Drusus at the Porta S. Sebastiano, toiling up the Capitoline Hill past the tabularium of the Capitol, dwelling in his hired house in the Via Lata or elsewhere, imprisoned in those painted caves in the Prætorian Camp, and at last pouring out his blood for Christ at the Tre Fontane, on the road to Ostia. But these things can only be thus mentioned, and this section drawn to a close with a notice of what, for its purpose, is more important —the object of St. Paul's conduct and discourse to the Jews in Rome, and the reason of the history closing as it does.

The Christian church at Rome was unquestionably the first of all the Gentile churches in importance. To it the Apostle had already written the most elaborate and greatest of his epistles. Yet in this narrative no notice of that church is found, further than that brethren came out to meet St. Paul on the Appian Way. On the other hand, his whole care on his arrival appears to have been for the Jews, whom he forthwith assembles at his lodging. How is this to be accounted for?

The answer is not far to seek: and is one which admirably sets forth the unity of design of our history. It is found partly in the fact, that St. Luke does not commonly relate that which took place in the Christian churches already founded. St. Paul spent three years at Ephesus—and a year and a half on one occasion, and three months on another, at Corinth;—but we hear nothing which took place among the Christians themselves during these periods. This of itself would be enough to vindicate our history from the charge of inconsistency, in the omission of notice of the Christian church at Rome. But there is another reason, even more apposite. This narrative is evidently drawn up under the personal superintendence of

the Apostle. It is a record of his zeal and love for Israel, his own people. 'The Jew first, and also the Gentile,' is the leading maxim of the missionary work of even the great Apostle of the Gentiles himself. And as this was the order in which our Lord's parting command had laid down the spread of the Testimony to Himself, so this book, which is but an exemplification how that command was carried out, ends with the final attempt of St. Paul for the conversion of his countrymen. We know from himself (Rom. xi. 25, 26) that when the fulness of the Gentiles was come in, Israel was to be saved. His work amongst the Gentiles had now reached its highest point. Asia and Europe—Antioch, Athens, Corinth,—had been filled with his testimony of the Gospel of the grace of God: it might seem to him, now that he had reached the chief city of the world, now that he had seen and joined himself to the great Gentile Church there founded, that the moment was come for Israel to look on Him whom they had pierced.

But gently, and cautiously, he clears the way before him for this testimony: taking care that his appearing as a prisoner from Judea, and his having appealed to Cæsar, should not in their

minds create a prejudice against him. And thus he opens his commission, and once more goes over the accustomed ground, persuading them concerning Jesus from the law of Moses and from the Prophets, from morning to evening. On this there was a division among them, ending, as the narrative implies, in the official rejection of the Apostle's message. And thus he dismisses them, remarkably enough with the very same prophetic words of Isaiah, with which our Lord had opened His teaching by parables.

And, this having been done, the history of this book closes : and with it the historical Scriptures. All further notices have to be gleaned from the Epistles, and the Book of Revelation.

For this apparently abrupt termination, the best assignable reason beyond doubt is, that at the end of the two years here spoken of, during which Paul dwelt in his hired house at Rome, this book, the Acts of the Apostles, was published ; and therefore there was nothing more to tell. Another reason coincides with this, viz., that the subject of the book has now reached a certain completion, the preaching of the Word having been brought as far as to Rome itself, the capital of the world. But

too much weight must not be laid upon this. The original commission by our Lord (ch. i. 8) did not stop but with '*the ends of the earth*:' and there can be no doubt that had there been a further journey of St. Paul, and wider dispersion of the testimony to relate, it would have been related.

I close this series of our New Testament notices with the usual tables of matters to be otherwise read, or otherwise rendered from the Greek, in the long portion which has been under our notice.

First, for passages which should be otherwise read in the Greek text.

In ch. xiii. 18, it is doubtful (see margin of English version) whether the term ought to be 'bore their manners,' or, 'bore them as a nurse.' The difference is that of only one letter in the Greek, and the ancient manuscripts are divided in their testimony. In ver. 42, for '*when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought*,' read 'now when they were going out, they besought.'

Ch. xiv. 17, most of the ancient MSS. read 'your hearts,' not '*our* hearts.'

Ch. xv. 7, '*among us*,' should be 'among you.' In ver. 11, omit '*Christ*.' In verses 17, 18, there is a remarkable variety of reading. That in our

version, '*saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world,*' is only found, as it stands, in some of the ancient *Latin* MSS. The reading of the three most ancient *Greek* MSS., and of several others of good authority, is merely this: 'saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from the beginning.' And this reading is now generally adopted. In ver. 23, for '*the apostles, and elders, and brethren,*' read 'the apostles and the elder brethren.' In ver. 24, omit '*saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law.*' In ver. 33, for '*the apostles,*' read 'them that sent them.' Ver. 34 is omitted altogether by our three oldest MSS. It has been inserted in order to explain the circumstance that Silas afterwards went from Antioch with St. Paul. One of the old MSS. which contains it, further inserts, 'but Judas went by himself:' thus showing plainly the apocryphal character of the verse. In ver. 36, for '*our* brethren,' read 'the brethren.' In ver. 40, for '*God,*' read 'the Lord.'

In ch. xvi. 7, for '*the Spirit,*' read 'the Spirit of Jesus.' In ver. 10, for '*the Lord,*' read 'God.' In ver. 13, for 'out of the *city,*' read 'out of the gate.' In ver. 31, omit '*Christ.*'

Ch. xvii. 5, omit '*which believed not.*' Ver. 27, for '*the Lord,*' read 'God.'

Ch. xviii. 1, for '*Paul* departed,' read 'he departed.' In ver. 5, for '*was pressed in the spirit,*' read 'was earnestly occupied in discoursing.' In ver. 15, for '*if it be a question,*' read 'if there be questions.' In ver. 17, for '*then all the Greeks took,*' read 'then they all took.' In ver. 19, read 'and they came to Ephesus, and he left them there.' In ver. 20, omit '*with them.*' Ver. 21 ought to stand thus: 'But bidding them farewell, and saying, I will return again unto you, if God will, he sailed from Ephesus,' omitting all the rest. In ver. 25, for '*the things of the Lord,*' read 'the things concerning Jesus.' In ver. 26, for '*Aquila and Priscilla,*' read 'Priscilla and Aquila' (see Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19). In the same verse, omit '*of God.*'

Ch. xix. 4, omit '*Christ.*' In ver. 9, omit '*one.*' In ver. 10, omit '*Jesus.*' In ver. 16, for '*overcame them,*' read 'overcame both of them.' There seem to have been two thus employed on this particular occasion. In ver. 29, for '*the whole city,*' read 'the city.' In ver. 35, omit '*goddess.*' In ver. 37, for '*your* goddess,' read 'our goddess.'

Ch. xx. 4, read, 'Sopater, the son of Pyrrhus, a Berœan.' Ver. 7, for '*the disciples*,' read 'we.' Ver. 8, for '*they were*,' read 'we were.' Ver. 11, for '*bread*,' read 'the bread'—*i.e.*, the usual sacramental bread. Ver. 19, omit '*many*.' Ver. 21, omit '*Christ*.' Ver. 24 ought to stand thus: 'But I hold my life of no account, nor precious to me, in comparison of finishing my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to complete my testimony of the gospel of the grace of God.' In ver. 25, the words, '*of God*,' should be omitted. In ver. 28, there is a great question between the readings, 'the Church of God,' and 'the Church of the Lord;' the great MSS. being divided. The whole matter will be found discussed in my note on the place. The result has been, that I see no reason for departing from the reading, 'the Church of God,' which is found in our two oldest MSS., the Sinaitic and the Vatican. In ver. 29, omit '*For*,' and '*this*:' and in ver. 32, omit '*brethren*:' and in ver. 34, omit '*yea*.'

In ch. xxi. 8, for 'we *that were of Paul's company*,' read 'we.' In ver. 20, for '*the Lord*,' read 'God:' and for '*of Jews*,' read 'among the

Jews.' Ver. 24, for '*may* know,' read 'shall know.'

In ch. xxii. 3, omit '*verily*.' Ver. 9, omit '*and were afraid*.' Ver. 16, for '*the name of the Lord*,' read 'his name.' In ver. 20, omit '*unto his death*' (it has been supplied from ch. viii. 1, and is not found here in any of the oldest MSS.). In ver. 26, for '*take heed what thou doest*,' read 'what art thou about to do?' In ver. 30, for '*to appear*,' read 'to assemble:' and for '*their* council,' 'the council.'

In ch. xxiii. 6, for '*the son of a Pharisee*,' read 'the son of Pharisees.' In ver. 9, for '*the scribes*,' read 'some of the scribes;' and for the latter part of the verse read, 'but peradventure a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him:' omitting '*let us not fight against God*,' which words are not in the oldest MSS., and have apparently found their way in from ch. v. 39. In ver. 11, omit '*Paul*.' In ver. 12, for '*certain of the Jews*,' read 'the Jews.' In ver. 20, for 'as though *they would* inquire,' read 'as though thou wouldest inquire.' In ver. 30, the true reading is, 'But when it was told me, that a plot was prepared against the man.' At the end of the verse, omit 'Farewell.'

Ch. xxiv. 1, for '*the elders*,' read 'some of the elders.' Verses 6-8; the whole passage from 'we took' to 'come unto thee,' is omitted in the principal ancient MSS. It must here be matter of doubt, how far we may discern traces of deliberate abridgment of the text in the Acts, in the earliest MSS. This is only one of numerous passages, where it appears most unlikely that the shorter text should have been the original. In such cases, the words in question should be retained, but enclosed within brackets, to denote their doubtful genuineness. In ver. 10, for '*the more* cheerfully, read 'cheerfully.' In ver. 13, for '*prove*,' read 'prove unto thee.' In ver. 15, omit '*of the dead*.' In ver. 18, for '*whereupon*,' read 'amidst which.' In ver. 22, for '*and when Felix heard these things*,' read 'and Felix,' omitting 'he' below. In ver. 23, for '*Paul*,' read '*him*:' and at the end of the verse, omit '*or come*.' In ver. 26, omit '*that he might loose him*.'

Ch. xxv. 2, for 'the *high priest*,' read 'the chief priests.' In ver. 6, it should stand as in the margin of our version, 'not more than eight or ten days.' The alteration has probably been made, because it was supposed that Scripture could not

leave anything uncertain. In ver. 7, after 'round about,' insert 'him :' and omit '*against Paul*,' beginning the next verse, 'while Paul answered for himself.' Ver. 11 should begin, 'If indeed I be an offender.' In ver. 16, omit '*to die*.' In ver. 18, for '*none accusation*,' read 'no wicked accusation.'

Ch. xxvi. 15, for '*he*,' read 'the Lord :' ver. 17, omit '*now*.' In ver. 30, omit '*when he had thus spoken*.'

Ch. xxvii. 2, read, 'a ship of Adramyttium which was to sail towards the coast of Asia, we put to sea.' Ver. 12, omit '*also*.' Ver. 14, for '*Euroclydon*,' read 'Euraquilon.' Ver. 16, '*Clauda*' ought most probably to be 'Cauda.' Ver. 19, for '*we* cast out,' read 'they cast out.' Ver. 34, for '*fall*,' read 'perish.'

Ch. xxviii. 3, for '*a bundle*,' read 'a certain quantity.' In ver. 16, the principal ancient manuscripts omit the words, 'the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard : but.' At all events, if retained (see above, on ch. xxiv. 6-8), they should be enclosed in brackets. In ver. 25, for '*our* fathers,' read 'your fathers.' In ver. 28, for '*the* salvation of God,' read 'this sal-

vation of God.' Ver. 29 is omitted by all the most ancient manuscripts and versions.

The chief cases where our *rendering* requires correction, are the following :—

In ch. xiii. 1, for '*which had been brought up with*,' substitute 'foster-brother of.' In ver. 4, for '*departed*,' 'went down.' In ver. 19, it should stand, 'And he destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, and divided,' etc. ; and in ver. 22, 'And he removed him, and raised up,' etc. In ver. 23, 'Of this man's seed hath God according to promise brought unto Israel,' etc. In ver. 24, '*before his coming*' is literally 'before the presence of his coming ;' 'before' not meaning '*previously to*,' but as in the words, 'Behold, I send thy messenger before thy face.' In ver. 26, omit '*men and ;*' [1] and instead of '*whosoever among you feareth God*,' 'those among you who fear God.' Ver. 28 should stand, 'And when they found no cause of death in him, they desired Pilate,' etc. In ver. 33, after 'raised up Jesus,' omit '*again*.' It is not the Resurrection of our Lord, but His mission, which is spoken of. In ver. 34, the word rendered '*mercies*' signifies 'holy things,' the word 'holy'

[1] So also in ver. 38 ; ch. xv. 7, 13 : xxiii. 1, 6 ; xxviii. 17.

should have been retained. Perhaps 'the mercies of David, holy and sure,' would have been the best rendering. In ver. 38, '*preached*' would be better here 'announced;' and ver. 39 should stand, 'And in Him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified in [under] the law of Moses.' In ver. 42, read and render, 'And as they were going out, they besought that these words might be spoken,' etc. In ver. 48, for '*ordained*,' render 'disposed.' This is a change of importance, as this text has been misapplied to support a doctrine to which it has no reference. The word in the original is the same as that used in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 of the house of Stephanas, where it is said, in our version, that they have *addicted themselves* to the ministry of the saints; and this meaning, of *the disposition of mind of the persons spoken of*, should have been kept here also. *By whom* these persons were so disposed, will of course be understood by every Christian, but is not expressed in the word.

In ch. xiv. 2, render, 'But the Jews which believed not, stirred up and embittered the minds of the Gentiles against the brethren.' In ver. 5, '*an assault*' ought to be 'a stir,' 'a movement.' If an

assault had been made on them, they could not but have been 'ware of it.' In ver. 9, 'was listening to Paul speaking.' In ver. 13, 'brought bulls and garlands unto the doors.' In ver. 14, for '*ran in*,' 'rushed forth.' In ver. 15, for '*vanities*,' 'vain gods.' In ver. 16, for '*times*,' 'the generations.' In ver. 18, for '*the people*,' 'the multitude;' and in ver. 19, 'the multitudes.' In ver. 21, '*taught many*,' should be 'made many disciples.' (See on Matt. xxviii. 19.) In ver. 22, '*much tribulation*' should be 'many tribulations.' Ver. 23, '*ordained*' should be 'elected'—an important fact to be held fast. The verse should end, 'they prayed with fasting, and commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed.' In ver. 27, render, for perspicuity, instead of '*how*,' 'that.' It was not the *manner*, but the *fact*, which they told them.

In ch. xv. 3, for '*and*,' 'so then.' Ver. 9, for '*faith*,' 'their faith.' Ver. 11, for '*But*,' 'Howbeit.' Ver. 12, for '*miracles*,' 'signs,' as in ch. v. 12, vii. 36, xiv. 3. Ver. 19, for '*turned*,' 'turning.' Ver. 21, for '*of* old time,' 'from of old time.' Ver. 22, 'to choose out men of their own company, and send them.' Ver. 26, '*hazarded*' is

literally 'delivered up.' Ver. 37, for '*determined*,' 'was minded.'

Ch. xvi. 5, 'So then the churches were,' etc. Ver. 6, for '*and were forbidden of*,' 'being hindered by.' Ver. 12, for '*the chief city of that part of Macedonia*,' 'the first Macedonian city of the district.' Ver. 14, for '*heard us*,' 'was listening.' Ver. 16, for '*prayer*,' 'the place of prayer.' In ver. 17, for '*shew*,' 'tell.' Ver. 25, 'Paul and Silas, in their prayers, were singing praises unto God, and the prisoners were listening to them.' Ver. 27, 'was about to kill himself.' Ver. 29, '*a light*,' should be 'lights.' Ver. 34, '*brought them*,' should be 'brought them up;' the prison was underground. Ver. 40, '*comforted*' should probably be 'exhorted.'

Ch. xvii. 5, for '*gathered a company*,' 'made a riot.' Ver. 9, for '*the other*,' which is meant by our translators to be *plural*, 'the rest.' Ver. 11, for '*and searched*,' 'searching.' Ver. 13, 'at Berœa also, they came stirring up and troubling the multitude there likewise.' Ver. 15, '*unto*' should be 'as far as.' Ver. 18, 'What meaneth this babbler to say?' Ver. 19, '*Areopagus*' should be, as in ver. 22, 'the hill of Mars.' Ver. 21,

'*For*' should be 'Now.' Ver. 22, '*too superstitious*' is a sad mistake, causing the English reader to miss the fine tact and skill of the address; it should be, 'very religious.' Ver. 23 should stand, 'For as I passed by, and beheld your objects of worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. What therefore ye ignorantly worship, that declare I unto you.' Ver. 24, 'The God,' etc. Ver. 25, for '*worshipped with*,' 'served by.' Ver. 26, 'And caused every nation of men, sprung of one blood, to dwell on all the face of the earth, and determined the times appointed,' etc. In ver. 30, '*winked at*' should be 'overlooked.' Ver. 33, '*So*' should be 'And thus.'

Ch. xviii. 5, '*And*' should be 'But,'[1] and '*Christ*' should be 'the Christ.' In ver. 6, '*shook*' should be 'shook out,' and it would better stand, 'I shall henceforth with a clear conscience go unto the Gentiles.' In ver. 13, for '*this fellow*,' 'this man.' Ver. 25, for '*was*,' 'had been;' for '*diligently*,' 'accurately,' and in ver. 16, for '*more perfectly*,' 'more accurately,' the adjective being the same.

[1] So also in ver. 6.

Ch. xix. 1, for '*coasts*,' 'parts.' Ver. 2, 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? And they said unto him, We did not so much as hear whether there were any Holy Ghost.' The mistake of the authorized version confuses the whole history. In ver. 9, for '*that* way,' 'the way.'[1] In ver. 24, for '*gain*,' and in ver. 25, for '*craft*,' render 'employment:' the word being the same. In ver. 33, 'Some of the multitude drew forth Alexander.' In ver. 35, for '*people*,' 'multitude.' '*Worshipper*' is literally 'temple-keeper.' In ver. 37, 'temples,' instead of '*churches*.' In ver. 38, for '*the law is open*,' 'court-days are held.' Ver. 39, for '*a*,' 'the.'

Ch. xx. 6, for '*we*,' 'we ourselves.' Ver. 9, for '*in a* window,' 'on the window seat.' Ver. 11, for '*bread*,' 'the bread.' Ver. 15, for '*arrived at*,' 'put in to.' Ver. 16, 'that he might not have to spend the time in Asia.' Ver. 18, for '*have been*,' 'was.' Ver. 26, for '*record*,' 'witness.' In ver. 28, for '*overseers*,' 'bishops:' elders and bishops, in the primitive Church, were the same. Ver. 30, for '*disciples*,' 'the disciples.' Ver. 38, for '*spake*,' 'had spoken.'

[1] So also in ver. 23, and ch. xxiv. 22.

Chap. xxi. 1, for '*were gotten from them*,' 'had torn ourselves away from them.' Ver. 3, for '*into*,' 'towards.' Ver. 4, 'But having sought out the disciples.' Ver. 6, 'we embarked in the ship.' Ver. 7, 'And finishing our voyage, we came from Tyre to Ptolemais.' Ver. 8, for '*which was*,' 'being:' the *reason* is given, *why* they abode with him. Ver. 13, 'What do ye, weeping and breaking.' Ver. 15, for '*carriages*,' 'baggage.' Ver. 16, 'from Cæsarea.' Ver. 20, 'how many thousands there are among the Jews which have become believers.' Ver. 22, better 'a multitude will certainly come together.' Ver. 24, 'at charges for them,' etc.: 'and all shall know.' Ver. 25, 'which have become believers, we have written, decreeing.' Ver. 26, 'the offering.' Ver. 27, 'which were from Asia.' Ver. 31, 'as they were seeking to kill him.' Ver. 36, 'the violence of the crowd.' Ver. 38, 'thou art not then that Egyptian:' and for '*four thousand*,' 'those four thousand.' Ver. 39, 'a Jew of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city in Cilicia.'

Ch. xxii. 1, omit '*men*.' Ver. 3, 'In Tarsus of Cilicia.' Ver. 6, 'coming nigh unto Damascus.' Ver. 22, 'unto this saying:' and for '*is* not fit,'

'was not fit.' Ver. 23, for '*cast off*,' 'shook.' Ver. 25, 'with the thongs,' which were commonly used for the purpose. Ver. 29, 'when he bethought him that he was a Roman, and that he had bound him.' Ver. 30, 'wishing to know the certainty.'

Ch. xxiii. 6, 'But Paul, being aware,' etc. Ver. 15, 'as though ye would determine with greater accuracy.' Ver. 27, 'then came I with the troop.' Ver. 35, 'Herod's palace.'

Ch. xxiv. 5, 'the heresy of the Nazarenes.' Ver. 16, 'do I also exercise myself.' Ver. 25, 'the judgment which is to come, Felix, becoming alarmed, answered.' There is nothing about *trembling* in the original. Ver. 27, 'willing to win favour with the Jews:' so also in ch. xxv. 9.

Ch. xxv. 5, 'which are powerful among you,' instead of '*which among you are able*.' Ver. 11, for '*or*,' 'and.' Ver. 18, for '*against*,' 'round about.' Ver. 19, for '*superstition*,' 'religion.' Ver. 25, 'But I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death: and seeing that he himself appealed to Augustus, I determined to send him.' Ver. 27, for '*to send*,' 'when sending a prisoner, not withal to,' etc.

Ch. xxvi. 3, 'Especially because thou art expert.' Ver. 8, 'if God raiseth the dead.' Ver. 10, 'I gave my vote against them.' Ver. 18, for '*to turn them,*' render 'that they may turn.' Ver. 20, 'them of Damascus and Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judæa and to the Gentiles:' and for '*meet for,*' 'worthy of their.' Ver. 21, 'endeavoured to kill me.' Ver. 23, 'If at least Christ was to suffer, and, first rising from the dead, was to.' Ver. 24, 'thy much learning.' Ver. 28, 'With small persuasion thinkest thou that thou canst make me a Christian.' And in ver. 29, 'I would to God, that, whether with little persuasion or with much, not only thou, but also all who hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds.'

Ch. xxvii. 2, 'a ship of Adramyttium, which was about to sail by the coasts of Asia, we put to sea.' Ver. 7, for '*scarce,*' 'with difficulty.' Ver. 9, for '*sailing,*' 'the voyage.' Ver. 12, for '*lieth toward the south-west and north-west,*' 'looketh toward the north-east and the south-east.' Ver. 14, for '*there arose against it,*' 'there blew down from it,' *i.e.*, from *Crete.* Ver. 17, for '*the quicksands,*' 'the quicksand,' or 'the Syrtis,' the great quicksand on

the African coast: and for '*strake sail*,' 'lowered the gear;' *i.e.*, struck the top-mast, and set all their sails. The authorized version makes them, as Mr. Smith has observed, do the very thing which was sure to bring about what they wished to avoid. Ver. 19, for '*tackling*,' 'furniture.' Ver. 21, for '*to have gained*,' 'should have been spared.' Ver. 25, for '*was*,' 'hath been.' Ver. 30, for '*cast anchors*,' 'carried anchors.' Ver. 34, for '*health*,' 'safety.' Ver. 38, for '*and cast*,' 'casting.' Ver. 39, 'on which they were minded, if it were possible, to run the ship aground.' Ver 40 should run thus—'And when they had cut off the anchors, they left them in the sea:' and for '*main sail*,' 'fore sail.'

Ch. xxviii. 2, for '*barbarous people*,' 'barbarians,' as in ver. 4, Rom. i. 14, 1 Cor. xiv. 11, Col. iii. 11; and for '*little*,' 'common.' Ver. 6, 'when they were long looking.' Ver. 9, for '*others*,' 'the rest.' Ver. 13, 'the south wind sprung up, and we came the second day to Puteoli.' Ver. 15, for '*of us*,' 'the tidings concerning us.' Ver. 22, '*sect*' is literally 'heresy.'

APPENDIX

CONTAINING A POPULAR ACCOUNT OF THE PRINCIPAL ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

---

1. THE VATICAN MANUSCRIPT.—This is by common consent allowed to be the oldest existing copy of the sacred text. It was probably written in Egypt, in the fourth century, *i.e.*, between A.D. 300 and 400. It is in the Vatican Library at Rome, and, owing to the vexatious restrictions of that establishment, is almost inaccessible to scholars. No accurate edition of it has ever been published, and in some passages it is still doubtful what its text is. I had access to it for five days in 1861, and examined some hundred or two of doubtful places; but five days' work in Rome is equal to not more than two days' in England, the nominal library hours at the Vatican being only three, and the real ones not more than two and a quarter. This MS. is contained in one small quarto volume. It is written on vellum, very clearly and beautifully, and is in admirable preservation. Were it anywhere but at Rome, it would long ago have been photographed, and thus given in its original form to the Church. Permission to effect this has more than once been sought, but has been as often persistently refused. The whole treatment of this great manuscript, including the

pretended edition of it by the late Cardinal Mai, is a disgrace to the Roman Catholic Church.

2. THE SINAITIC MANUSCRIPT.—This, which is in value almost equal to the Vatican, was procured by Professor Tischendorf in 1859 from the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. It also is supposed to have been written in the fourth century. A magnificent edition of this MS., printed page for page and line for line, with types cast to imitate the letters of the original, was sent forth from St. Petersburg in 1863, and is now to be found in most of our considerable libraries. An audacious assertion was made by a celebrated forger of manuscripts, named Simonides, to the effect that he, when young, *wrote this* MS. with his own hand. But this is completely disproved by the phenomena of the MS. itself, and is now entirely exploded, and the MS. received unhesitatingly by all scholars as one of the principal ancient testimonies to the sacred text.

3. THE PARISIAN MANUSCRIPT.—This very valuable MS. is unfortunately only a series of considerable fragments, with large gaps between them. It is of that kind called *palimpsest*, being writing which has been again written over by a later hand and with other matter, so that the sacred text has to be painfully deciphered *beneath* the same modern writing. It is supposed to have been originally written in the fifth century, *i.e.*, between A.D. 400 and 500. An accurate edition of it has been published by Professor Tischendorf, page for page and line for line.

4. THE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPT.—This MS. once belonged to Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, and was by him presented to our King Charles I. It is now in the British Museum. It is generally believed to have been written in the fifth century. An edition, in types imitating the original, and page for page and line for line, was pub-

lished in London by Woide, in 1786; and there is a modern one, in ordinary type, by Mr. Harris Cowper. This MS. is in quarto, much dilapidated, the ink of the letters having eaten through the vellum, and it would in consequence be extremely difficult to photograph effectively.

5. THE CAMBRIDGE MANUSCRIPT, presented by the Reformer Beza to the University Library at Cambridge in 1581. Edited, with imitation types, and line for line, by Dr. Kipling, in 1793; and re-edited still more carefully by Mr. Scrivener in our own time. This very remarkable MS. is now generally supposed to have been written in the latter end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century. The sacred text in this MS. is peculiar, differing often very much in form of expression, and not seldom in sense also, from that in the rest. Sometimes, and especially in the Acts of the Apostles, clauses and passages are found which are not in the other MSS. The origin of these must ever remain a matter of question—whether they have been inserted in a shorter original text, or were originally in the text, and have been excluded by a process of abridgment.

These are the most considerable ancient authorities to the Gospels and Acts. Of them—

THE VATICAN MS. contains the Gospels and Acts complete.

THE SINAITIC MS. the same.

THE PARISIAN MS., as above noticed, fragments only.

THE ALEXANDRIAN MS. has unfortunately had the first leaves torn off, and does not begin till Matt. xxv. 6. It has also lost from John vi. 50 to viii. 52.

THE CAMBRIDGE MS. contains the Gospels and Acts, but with many and considerable gaps, *e.g.*, Matt. vi. 20 to ix. 2; John i. 16 to iii. 26; xviii. 13 to xx. 13; Acts viii. 29 to x. 14; and xxii. 29 to end.

There are, besides these, several manuscripts of similar date, containing larger or smaller portions of the whole: as, *e.g.*, a Dublin MS. of the sixth century, containing the Gospel of St. Matthew, two 'palimpsest' fragments at Wolfenbüttel, containing many fragments, and written in the fifth and sixth centuries, etc. etc.

And there are the testimonies of the ancient versions into different languages, some of them far older than our oldest MSS., and the testimonies of quotation in the writings of the ancient Fathers. These latter are of course somewhat difficult to get at, seeing that these writers quoted often from memory, and attributed to one evangelist the words of another. But sometimes, where an author quotes *expressly*, or discriminates by name one evangelist from another, the testimony is precise and valuable.

EDINBURGH: T. CONSTABLE,
PRINTER TO THE QUEEN, AND TO THE UNIVERSITY.

00111047

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016